

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIX.

October, 1913.

No. 7.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS
BALTIMORE

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIX.

October, 1913.

No. 7.

HOW THE THREE THOUSAND WERE CONVERTED.

I

Catholic teaching holds that, in the economy of grace established under the New Dispensation, for the salvation of the individual God insists upon two conditions—Christian faith and Church membership. Faith is not a blind or slavish submission to certain dogmas of belief, but a reasonable assent of the mind to doctrines as revealed and divine, on the basis of such evidence as begets moral certainty that these doctrines have been divinely revealed. Whereas the condition of membership is realized by submission to a certain rite of initiation and to the authority to teach and govern which resides in the Church. According to the divine appointment, therefore, to be saved a man must not only believe with true faith what God has revealed, but he must submit with true obedience to the dictates of the Church. Now, while this economy derives its existence from the institution of Christ, and on examination may invoke the highest encomiums on the wisdom of its Ordainer because of its adaptation to the needs of man, yet, is there no *a priori* reason why one on becoming a Christian—a believer in and follower of Christ—should thereby become a citizen and subject of an ecclesiastical society. We could conceive a disposition of things whereby Christ, the Divine Teacher,

would insist simply on faith in Him as a condition of participation in his divine life and in the fruits of His redemption; where each believer would individually and immediately enter into union with Christ and be guided by His Holy Spirit without the medium of a society or church which intervenes between Christ and the individual, and through which, and by obedience to which, the individual can and must discharge his duties towards God and His Saviour. In this case faith in Christ and in His revelation, apart from affiliation to a church, would be the order of salvation. We go further and conceive an economy of salvation where not even *rational* faith—faith based on external evidence generative of intellectual conviction—would be a necessity; where the invisible operation of the Holy Ghost in the soul of each man would insure for him salvation. This condition of things would meet the cherished hopes of such liberal Protestants as are adverse to religious authority and advocate the “religion of the spirit,” and of such Modernist and Kantianists as are hostile to what they regard as the mental slavery superinduced by external evidence and intellectual processes in matters of religion where the “method of Immanence,” should be our sole guide. All external constraint, under which the modern mind chafes, is abolished. The authority of a church is first removed, then follows the compulsion of external evidence such as rational faith, in the Catholic sense, exacts—until the spirit of man, emancipated from the weak and needy elements of the external world and the external senses, is free as the flowers of the field to tend whither the spirit of God inspires.

Such theories are not *in se*, and as fancies created by the ever inventive genius of man, unworthy of contemplation. Be they ever so inadequate to the needs of human nature as it really exists, they at all events suggest possibilities in an ideal order of things—what may be realizable were man somewhat differently constituted, and did Providence dispose things otherwise than we really find them. But when these theorists, or shall we say visionaries, invoke the testimony of Christ or

His Apostles in support of their fancies we feel bound to call a halt. When they would deny to Christ the institution of a church—as incompatible with his belief in the “Parousia,” or the near approach of His second coming—and deny to His immediate followers the need of insisting on external historic happenings as the basis of Christian belief—because, foresooth, faith is but a trust in the goodness of God, or a growth divine within the soul—we enter our most emphatic protest, and inform them that these fancies are a fabric woven out of their innermost consciousness, but that they are in direct antagonism to the palpable facts of history, in open opposition to the doctrine and practice of Christ and the Apostles, and of the whole of Christendom down through the ages.

In confirmation of this statement we propose to adduce one incident, one piece of evidence which, by reason of its circumstances, we regard as a touch-stone by which the hollow claims of modern liberalism are disclosed, and the solidity and truth of the Catholic tradition are made manifest. We bring forward for consideration the first Christian sermon by which was effected the conversion of the first group of Christians. We ask ourselves how this conversion from Judaism to Christianity was brought about. In what did it consist? And what exactly constituted these men Christians who hitherto had been devoted adherents of the Jewish faith? The admirable address of St. Peter on that first Pentecost Sunday, and the consequent conversion and reception into the Christian fold of these three thousand souls have a great deal of apologetic value for us in dealing with modern problems that concern the Christian faith of the Catholic Church. Reading through the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles where St. Luke, the historian of the Infant Church, has beautifully and concisely crystalized for us the events of the day of Pentecost, we very easily pass over the full significance of the brief record. Studying the events of the distant past we are inclined to regard them as vague and indefinite. We need a special effort of concentration to make us realize that they were as objective

and as living as those that happen in our midst today, and agitate us so deeply. If we yield to this weakness, we come to regard the conversion of the first Christians as due, not to any intellectual convictions of the truth of the Gospel, but, to a kind of frenzied enthusiasm produced by the Holy Spirit, which urged them to join that little band of disciples who had attached themselves to the person of Our Lord; and, that the Christians themselves were knit together, not by any clear or definable ties of a common faith, authority and worship, but, by a vague general sentiment. If we desire to be disabused of this erroneous impression which seems to so mercilessly dominate non-Catholic Christians of today, we have but to carefully study and analyse the discourse of St. Peter and its results, as described for us, in the second chapter of the Acts, by one whose authority as a historian is every day becoming more and more unquestioned and unquestionable.

We shall deal with our subject, then, under two heads: Firstly we shall examine the Apologetics of St. Peter—what motives of credibility he urged so as to beget in the minds of his listeners faith in Jesus as the Christ. Secondly when they did believe what more was deemed necessary to constitute them full disciples of the Master and to insure their eternal salvation? The answer to these two queries furnished by Christianity on that first day when promulgated by those Apostles who had been just imbued with power from on high, will give the quietus to the “religion of the spirit” and the “method of Immanence,” and will clearly establish for us the truth that Catholicity in its fundamental principles is as ancient as Christianity.

II

In compliance with the wishes of the Master, expressed on the day of His Ascension, that they remain in the city until they be “imbued with power from on high,” patiently, prayerfully and with all confidence did the Apostles and the disciples await in Jerusalem the coming of the Holy Ghost.

Fifty days have passed since the celebration of the Pasch (the first of the three great annual Festivals), when Jesus of Nazareth was crucified in the presence of the Jewish multitude assembled in the Holy City. Ten days have gone by since the Savior ascended into Heaven, and now the morning dawns upon the second great event of the Jewish year, the Pentecostal Feast. This also attracted to Jerusalem the faithful thousands of the chosen race, whether resident in the land of Israel, or scattered abroad among the benighted Gentiles. Hither had they come to celebrate this Harvest feast and to commemorate that greatest of events in the history of Israel—the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. What a suitable occasion here presents itself for the promulgation of the New Law, which was destined to fulfil, and, to a certain extent, to supplant the ordinances of the Mosaic code. The scene enacted on the Arabian Mount is about to be renewed, though in subdued form as befits the Dispensation of love, when “suddenly there came a sound from Heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them parted tongues as it were of fire, and it sat upon everyone of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with diverse tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak.” The commotion created by this marvelous occurrence excited the curiosity and attracted the attention of the crowds assembled in Jerusalem—“devout Jews, out of every nation under Heaven,”—who must have been already astir and moving towards the Temple to join in the morning sacrifice and devotions. The multitude came together and were confounded in mind when they heard the group of Christians—poor illiterate Galileans,—magnify God in diverse tongues, foreign to Palestinians, but native to the Jewish elements in the audience who hailed from the various Gentile nations. What does all this mean? To the devout it portended something wonderful and mysterious which they would fain understand. Nor were there lacking mockers who derisively remarked: “These men are full of

new wine." Here was an ideal opportunity to enlighten the confused multitude—whose attention was arrested and whose souls were rendered receptive by the marvels they had just witnessed. Peter, true to his charge as chief of the Apostolic band, rose equal to the occasion, and, filled with the Holy Ghost, delivered a discourse which, for accommodation to his audience, for close consistent argumentation, and for earnest and stirring appeal, excites our profound admiration. For concise completeness it is a model sermon and worthy of careful consideration. We shall study it as a beautiful apologetic argument by which the minds of the listeners are tactfully disposed, and convincingly persuaded to accept the claims of Jesus to be the Christ. The thesis, to speak scholastically, which St. Peter proposed to establish for his hearers is that contained in the closing verse of the discourse: "Let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus whom you have crucified." The crucified Jesus is then Christ the Lord—such is the claim. Are those Jews—whose dreams of earthly glory were shattered by the Gospel of Jesus, who were scandalized in His humility, who had actually succeeded in crucifying as a helpless impostor Him who claimed to be the Christ, but who was unable to deliver himself out of their hands—are they to admit without strongest, nay without overwhelming evidence his claims to Messiahship, when they incurred thereby the reprobation of their own spiritual leaders, and excommunication from the Jewish synagogue?¹ Unquestionably no! Yet did not St. Peter succeed in making three thousand converts on that same occasion? How did he accomplish this marvelous feat? Omitting the invisible workings of the Holy Ghost in their hearts, which is ever a vital factor in conversion to the true faith, and which is a gift of God freely granted to men of good will, we shall analyze the positive evidence which brought conviction to the minds of these converts and which served for what theologians call "the preamble of faith."

According to a well recognized law of Pedagogics, when

¹ Cf. ix, 22.

desirous of imparting a new truth the teacher must enter into the mind of the instructed, discover its view-point, take into account its prepossessions and prejudices, accommodate himself to its disposition, accept whatever of radical truth it already possesses as the stem on which the new doctrine must be ingrafted, while tactfully dispelling whatever is prejudicial. How perfectly this fundamental law was observed by St. Peter becomes manifest on examination. His audience were Jews steeped in Jewish prophecies, imbued with the Messianic hope, proud of the Patriarchs and Prophets, ever conscious of the special divine favors which were theirs as the chosen people, yea more, "the children of the Prophets and of the Testament which God made to their fathers." This was the stem on which must be ingrafted the claims of Jesus if they were to make the least appeal to the Jewish minds. But further, this Messianic hope had become somewhat perverted. Its spiritual meaning had become materialized. The Christ who according to the true sense of prophecy was to redeem mankind—the Jews first and through them the whole world—from the slavery of sin and death, who was to establish a kingdom of peace and righteousness by the sacrifice of self, had to the later Jewish mind been transformed into a temporal ruler who would, by casting off the galling yoke of Rome, and re-establishing Israel's supremacy with a splendor that would outshine the glories of David and Solomon, "restore again the kingdom of Israel." Here was a growth incompatible with the claims of Jesus—here was a prejudice that must be removed before the Messiahship of the Nazarene can find a lodgment in the Jewish mind. How adroitly St. Peter effected this result we shall presently see in an analysis of his argument.

III

Passing lightly over the mocking reference to their being intoxicated—yet to obviate unnecessary difficulties he dispels this suspicion by an allusion to the early hour of the day, for the Jews were not wont to break fast, especially on feast-

days, until after they had assisted at the morning sacrifice—Peter proceeds to satisfy the amazed and anxious inquirers in regard to the meaning of those manifestations of the Holy Spirit, which they had witnessed with their own eyes and heard with their own ears. He informs them that what they behold is the fulfilment of prophecy. "This was what was spoken of by the prophet Joel." These wonders you behold, this gift of tongues, these ecstasies and prophetic praises of God, are signs of "the last days" foretold by the prophet. Prophecy has therefore been fulfilled—the Christ must have come, the reign of the Messiah must have been already inaugurated, even if its full realization, to be signalized by still more startling portents, must await the consummation of all things, the second advent, "the great and manifest day of the Lord." Hence this is the acceptable time, this the day of salvation, when, in obedience to the counsel of the prophet, you are called upon to do penance and to convert yourselves unto the Lord if you would be saved; for the time has come when "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Thus he touches the conscience of his hearers and inspires them with that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom, while their curiosity he stimulates to serious inquiry by the implication rather than the express statement that the Christ must have come, since the signs of the Messianic times have partially appeared. Having prophetically interpreted for his audience those wonderful outpourings of the Pentecostal Spirit, as indicative of the advent of the Messiah, St. Peter takes one most important step forward in his argument, when, by a line of reasoning employing prophecy as the foundation and miracles and the testimony of the Apostles themselves for the superstructure he brings them face to face with the vital and startling truth that the Christ to be acknowledged and the Lord to be invoked for salvation is none other than Jesus of Nazareth—"a man approved of God in their midst" by many miracles, crucified and slain, raised to life again, and being exalted now sits at the right hand of God in Heaven, whence He has sent forth those gifts of the

Holy Ghost which they had witnessed. Behold the sum and substance of Peter's discourse, the Gospel which he preached, the faith or creed which he proclaims! Each article of that creed fulfills a Jewish prophecy, corresponds to a Jewish hope, accomplishes a Jewish expectation. The claim made in behalf of Jesus to be the Christ was then sustained at every point by unquestioned prophecy, whose fulfillment was confirmed by undeniable miracles, witnessed by the Apostles and the Jews themselves. The claim, therefore, was doubly sealed by Heaven with the twofold stamp of prophecy, whose fulfillment was confirmed by undeniable miracles, witnessed by the Apostles and the Jews themselves—greater confirmation of a divine mission and doctrine God Himself cannot furnish, nor can the intellect of man demand. These were the motives of credibility adduced by Peter—the grounds of conviction that sustained the faith of the first converts. Who would assert that such a faith was not reasonable? that it was a blind emotion that seized those early converts and drew them along unreasoningly to acknowledge the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ—while they in turn by their perfervid and fanatical zeal set in activity a vortex into which thousands were unwittingly drawn, and thus did Christianity make rapid progress? As we remarked at the outset, give the imagination free range and it will weave the most fascinating theories—but they are aerial castles made of the mists of morning, which vanish before the sunlight of historical evidence. The early Christians yielded to such motives and were persuaded by such evidence as are calculated to bring moral certainty to any rational and well-disposed mind that the claims—the mission, the doctrine and the religion—which rest on such a reliable foundation are assuredly divine, and in all prudence demand an assent of divine faith. But let us examine more in detail the argument by which the first Christians were converted to faith in Jesus as the Christ, in order that the wisdom of its presentation and the evidence of its persuasiveness be more clearly perceived.

IV

The prophet foretold the extraordinary signs of the Messianic age; he urged the need of calling upon the name of the Lord for salvation. You have this day witnessed the signs—they testify to you that the time has come when you are invited to receive the Messiah, to invoke the Lord if you would flee from the wrath to come, if you would ensure your salvation. But the Lord and the Christ who will save and deliver you is none other than Jesus of Nazareth Whom you have crucified—"Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under Heaven given to man whereby we must be saved."² So affirmed Peter; but surely he did not expect his hearers to accept without question, even in the presence of the wonders of Pentecost, his unproven statements. Accordingly he furnished proof of their verity. His first proof is the testimony of God Himself to the divine mission and Messianic claims of Jesus:—"Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you as you also know." This verse deserves our careful consideration in the face of modern rationalism which would eliminate from the "true" life of Christ the supernatural as the growth of later years. Jesus was undoubtedly a great reformer, a man of God, divine in a broad sense; he preached a sublime doctrine; he led a stainless life; He was an ideal teacher and an ideal man, but He did not interrupt the uniform course of events, whether in the historic development of the race, or in the operations of nature. Hence the miraculous works, the supernatural attributes ascribed to Him in the gospel-narrative are not objective—they are "the creations of faith," "the mythological growths" that universally pursue a great personage. This the insidious picture presented. Such a rationalistic fancy finds poor consolation in the verse quoted. According to the testimony of St. Peter, Jesus performed "miracles" of mighty power and "wonders"

²Acts IV, 12.

calculated to arrest the attention of the beholders, and "signs" which assured them that he worked the works of God (for this is the full significance of the terms employed). And bear in mind that Peter alludes not to something done in a corner, and known only to the few, which would leave room to suspect deception or invention. No! He reminds his hearers that these extraordinary works were performed in their midst so that they themselves had witnessed them. What a striking confirmation of the truth of the miraculous Gospel-history is furnished in this brief statement of St. Peter, as recorded for us by the painstaking historian who wrote for the first generation of Christians, after "having diligently attained to all things from the beginning." No room is left here for "the growth of myth" for the "creation of faith." Peter preaches fifty days after the termination of Christ's public career which covered but the short period of a few years. He addresses those who had seen Jesus, and in whose minds the memory of His extraordinary works was still fresh and green; nay more, on their admission of the reality of such works he builds his appeal for their recognition of Jesus as the Christ. Perforce then, must we admit that Jesus worked "miracles and wonders and signs," and the Gospel-history must not be called in question because of the presence therein of the miraculous and the supernatural.

But granted that Jesus performed miracles, still, can He be the Christ, for was He not crucified and slain? whereas the Christ must reign as a great king—He must reëstablish with unprecedented magnificence the kingdom of Israel? Such the attitude of mind of the multitude who attended on Peter's message. Peter anticipated the objection which was struggling for expression in their minds. Jesus was slain, but "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." What means this? It means that even by His death, which to the Jews proved such a stumbling block and rock of scandal, Jesus was but fulfilling prophecies and the more surely establishing his claim to the Messiahship. For had the Jews but properly

understood their Sacred Scriptures, had they interpreted their prophets aright, and not allowed them to be overclouded and perverted by human expectations of worldly glory and temporal power, they would have realized that (as Jesus Himself said to the Apostles after the Resurrection) "Christ should suffer these things and so enter into His glory,"³ they would have realized the significance of Peter's statements made in his second sermon of a few days later that in the death of Jesus "those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all His prophets, that His Christ should suffer, He hath so fulfilled";⁴ they would have looked forward like Blessed Simeon, not to the advent of a powerful conqueror and temporal monarch but to the spiritual deliverance of the race which was to be accomplished by the self sacrifice of the Christ, who was thereby to be exalted, and to govern with spiritual sway the universal kingdom of God.

Having thus disarmed the prejudices of the Jews and having removed from the path of their conversion the stumbling block created by the death of Him who claimed to be the Christ, Peter next adduces the strongest evidence, the most convincing proof that Jesus was the Christ: *He arose from the dead*. It is worthy of note how this fact of the Resurrection is made the keystone in the arch of proof of the validity of the claim of Jesus to be the Christ in all parts of the New Testament—the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles. His Resurrection from the dead is the supreme sign to which Jesus points forward in verification of His divine claims: it is the very *raison d'être* of the apostolate—to bear witness to the Resurrection of Jesus—as is evidenced in the Acts from the very outset:⁵ and in the Epistles it is declared to be the very foundation of the faith of the Christians.⁶ Here again to obviate the sophisms of rationalism how satisfactory to find the argument from the Resurrection so ably expounded by St. Peter, fifty days after the event, "during forty of which Jesus showed Himself alive

³ Luc. xxiv, 26.

⁴ Acts III, 18.

⁵ Acts I, 22.

⁶ I Cor. xv, 14.

to the Apostles by many proofs appearing to them and speaking of the kingdom of God.”⁷ In the first place Peter recalls to his hearers the words of the psalm which foretold how the Lord would not “suffer his Holy One to see corruption,” but that he would raise Him up and glorify Him. This promise was evidently not fulfilled in David, but remained to be fulfilled in One who, according to the prediction of David was to be descended from the royal prophet himself and who should sit upon his throne. “Foreseeing this,” adds Peter, “he spoke of the resurrection of Christ.” The death and resurrection of the Christ being established on the evidence of prophecy and therefore conceded by his hearers, Peter must satisfy them that Jesus rose from the dead. Herein enters the chief and primary function of the apostolate—to bear testimony to the Resurrection of Jesus. Hence the significance of the words of Peter in verse thirty-two, to be so emphatically repeated by himself and by the other Apostles on all future occasions: “This Jesus hath God raised again, where of all we are witnesses.”

The ultimate reason, and one supplementary to the Resurrection, given in evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus was His ascension. This reason completes and rounds off, as it were, the whole argument and leads the mind of the audience back to the miraculous manifestations with the explanation of which the discourse began. The same royal prophet had foretold in the memorable words of the 109th Psalm (whose inner meaning was sought in vain from the learned Scribes by Jesus Himself) the ascension of the Christ into Heaven: “The Lord said to my lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thy enemies thy foot-stool.” Jesus therefore after His Resurrection was exalted by God into Heaven, where He sits at the right hand of the Father, participating with him in the government of the world and thus He fulfills the office of the Messianic King, in proof whereof and in confirmation of our testimony thereto “He hath poured forth this which you see and hear.” After such an accumulative argument woven into a perfect

⁷ Acts 1, 3.

web of prophecies and miracles and earnest unwavering testimony that Jesus is the Christ—that in the former is miraculously accomplished all that was foretold of the latter—who can deny but that the thesis proposed has been thoroughly established? Hence the bold and fervent conclusion or peroration of Peter was fully justified on logical grounds by the evidence adduced and the argument developed: “Therefore, let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus whom you have crucified.” While the practical moral lesson implied and inculcated was: If you will be saved you must call upon the name of Jesus who is Christ the Lord. When this momentous truth was brought home to the hearers forcibly, so consistently, and so earnestly, need we be surprised that “they had compunction in their hearts,” and that to save themselves from the “perverse generation” they received the words, were baptized and added to the apostolic group to the number of “three thousand souls?”

V

We have carefully analyzed the argument developed by St. Peter in his discourse delivered on that first Pentecost Sunday; we have scrutinized its logical consistency and apologetic value; and taking into account the intrinsic nature of the evidence adduced and the mental attitude of the auditors, we doubt if with all our boasted intellectual progress, and modern critical acumen, we could weave an argument of more telling force, of greater objective validity, and of wiser subjective adaptation—where the motives of credibility are so admirably arranged, and so persuasively presented as to insure intellectual conviction and secure volitional assent, which are the human factors that generate faith. One objection alone may, with some show of plausibility, and from the view-point of modern higher criticism, be suggested. Perhaps the Old Testament passages quoted did not contain the prophetic sense Peter discovers in them. This objection is, as far as our present purpose is concerned, beside the mark. Our aim has been to show that the

faith of these earliest converts was *rational*, that their acceptance of Christ and Christianity—or to speak more accurately, their acceptance of Jesus as the Christ and His religion as divine—was not a blind sentimental submission devoid of all intellectual conviction begotten of external evidence. Whether Peter interpreted the Old Testament passages aright or not—and he, specially enlightened by the Holy Spirit, should be a better judge than we are—is another question. That he interpreted them in a manner agreeable to his contemporaries and his audience we may rest assured, and hence their apologetic and rational value for the minds of his hearers. Besides, the miracles wrought by Jesus and the facts of His Resurrection, and Ascension, and the mission of the Holy Ghost of which the Apostles and many others were eye-witnesses, possess for all an apologetic and intellectual value, independently of the consideration that these facts were the fulfillment of prophecy. But the combination of both and the accumulation of all constituted a preamble of faith overwhelming in its persuasiveness.

We have thus far dealt with one interesting aspect of the conversion of that first group of Christians. With the other aspect suggested we shall deal in a further contribution, wherein we shall endeavor to answer the equally if not more interesting question: At the inauguration of the New Dispensation what more than a rational faith was deemed essential to constitute one a true and full-fledged Christian? The answer furnished this question by the contemplation of the record which pictures for us that Pentecostal community, will be of no small assistance in discriminating between the merits of the fundamental position occupied by Catholic and Protestant Christianity, and will shed some clear light on the divine and apostolic origin of those principles on which the Catholic Church is reared.

(To be continued.)

CORNELIUS F. CREMIN, S. T. L.

ST. PAUL'S SEMINARY,
ST. PAUL, MINN.

THE ENGLISH CARTHUSIANS.

Notwithstanding the religious overturn of the sixteenth century—the ruthless wrench which severed England from the Church—the substitution of an heretical creed imported from Germany for the ancient *Ecclesia Anglicana*; the complete acclimation of Protestantism in a country once called “the Dowry of Mary” and noted for its devotion to St. Peter and the Holy See; notwithstanding the sanguinary penal code which strove to obliterate in blood every trace of Catholicism, it is surprising how many Catholic landmarks have continued to exist, despite it all. London alone, not to mention any other place, possesses many such. As Sir Walter Besant referring to traces of former monasticism in his impressionistic sketch of the history of the British metropolis, says: “You may find for yourselves where the London monasteries were by the names of the streets now standing on their sites. Thus, following the line of the wall from the Tower north and west you find St. Katherine’s Dock where stood St. Katherine’s Hospital. Minories marks the house of the Minorites or Sisters of St. Clare. Great St. Helen’s is on the site of St. Helen’s Nunnery. Spital square stands where St. Mary’s Spital¹ formerly received the sick. Blackfriars, Charterhouse and Bartholomew’s still keep their names. Austin Friars is the name of a Court; and the friars’ church still stands. Whitefriars is still the name of a street. Grey Friars is Christ’s Hospital. The Temple is now the lawyer’s home, and the church of the Knights Hospitallers is still to be seen. Three great houses, it is true, have left no trace or memory behind: Eastminster, where the Cistercian Abbey of St. Mary of Grace, which stood north of St. Katherine’s, and was a very great and stately place indeed; the Priory of the Holy Trinity, which stood where is now Duke’s Place, north of the Church of St. Katherine Cree and St. Mary’s of Bethlehem, which stood just outside Bishopsgate.

¹ Abbreviation of Hospital.

The memory of Bermondsey Abbey and St. Mary Overy on the south side of the river, has also departed, but the church of the latter still stands, the most beautiful church in London next to Westminster Abbey.”²

This list of Catholic landmarks in the heart of a Protestant country (as it is commonly, but perhaps erroneously, regarded, if count be taken of the spread of Ritualism and the increasing Romanward movement) might be easily lengthened. Many other traces of its Catholic past will readily recur to anyone familiar with London's highways and byways. Attention has quite recently been focussed on one of the places mentioned by Besant in the passage quoted—the Charterhouse, which in its reconstructed form, celebrated its tercentenary on December 12, 1911. The name is a corruption or transformation of *Chartreuse*. It was built in 1371 as a monastery for twenty-four Carthusian monks, who led their mortified lives there peaceably and holily until the Reformation, when the Prior and several monks were hanged and the remaining eight died of starvation and fever in Newgate Prison because they would not acknowledge the self-assumed spiritual supremacy of Henry VIII. There, the Blessed Sir Thomas More, one of the English martyrs, in early life spent five years—five of his happiest years when he dreamt of putting on the cowl instead of the coif, blissfully ignorant of the fate that awaited him; for martyrdom not monasticism was his goal. It was dissolved in 1540, and after being used by the King for the storage of his nets and pavilions, five years later was granted to Sir Edward North, who built a residence for himself to the east of the church. Twenty years afterwards the greater part of the property was purchased by the Duke of Norfolk, who erected a town House called Howard House on the site of the little cloister. His son, the Earl of Suffolk, sold it to Thomas Sutton, who had served Queen Elizabeth as her Master of Ordnance in the North, and who founded therein in 1612 the Brotherhood

² The History of London. By Walter Besant, 1893, p. 98.

of Charterhouse as a home or retreat for old and disabled soldiers and seamen, decayed merchants, or those who had endured captivity under the Turks. Such were to be the recipients of this charity according to statutes framed in 1613. As time went on a change was introduced which gave it a more distinctive character, and improved away the alms-house feature. The qualifications for the Brotherhood were defined at the Assembly of 1627 as follows: "Gentlemen by descent and in poverty, soldiers that have borne arms by sea or land, merchants decayed by piracy or shipwreck, or servants in the household to the King's Majesty." The mention of piracy recalls the fact that it was a time when the dreaded Corsairs roamed the seas from the Mediterranean to the British Isles. With the advent of the Commonwealth came a reversion to democratic ideas and the literal interpretation of Sutton's will by simply using the words "poor men" without any class limitation. The Chairmanship of the board of Governors was always filled by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but Laud was already in the Tower, to lay his head on the block on Tower Hill in January, 1645. Cromwell was a governor, and there was a time when the Board, or "Assembly," as it was called, was exclusively composed of Roundheads. The Huntingdon brewer who made himself Lord Protector of the Commonwealth was elected to fill the place of Manchester, who had been his companion in arms at Marston Moor. That Englishman of blood and iron, who made short work of the Long Parliament, once strode down to Charterhouse in a wrathful mood to a committee meeting to have the Royal arms, which were still above the entrance to the Hall and other places, removed and defaced. Another swing of the political pendulum, another turn of Fortune's wheel, having restored the Stuarts, the Royal arms were replaced, the Cromwellian governors were "invited to resign," and the men they had ousted were brought back. It is said that no colour of politics has at any time seemed to interfere with the conscientious government of the place. However that may have been, it was not so when differences of religion interposed; for when James II—every sover-

eign since James I has been a governor—nominated one Andrew Popham, a Catholic, to the Brotherhood, the Governors, through Thomas Burnet, the Master, respectfully objected that to elect a “Romanist” was contrary to their trust. But, notwithstanding this religious barrier which shuts out the adherents of the older creed of England, which was professed and practised by all from “the far, faithful North” to Cornwall, when Charterhouse was first built in the fourteenth century, there has clung to it or hangs round it, like the scent of the roses to a broken vase, a certain perfume of the past, an odour of the Catholic atmosphere which environed it in the bygone days of the Carthusians. As a London paper remarks: “If, your interest awakened by all that you hear, you pass through the quaint courts and the delightful rooms, full of the early glories of famous fashioners in wood and stone, you will find yourself subtly transplanted to a bygone day, in an atmosphere of peace and stateliness which has existed for three full centuries.” The writer might have said six centuries. In the chapel the oldest portions of the edifice have been preserved and protected by judicious covering and panelling. In the wall to the right of the Communion table—an innovation which three centuries ago displaced the Catholic altar—is a moveable panel covering an aumbry belonging to the original church, which followed the plan of nearly all Carthusian churches, being divided by a screen into two portions for the choir religious and the lay brothers. Near the vestry is a fragment of the tomb of Sir Walter de Manny, who died in 1372. The lower portion of the great hall, where the Brotherhood dine daily, belongs to the date of Prior Tynbygh’s improvements (1499-1529). They no longer occupy the old monastery barns and outbuildings, but these still exist.

The *genius loci* is not only manifest in these material mementoes, reminiscent of the ages when Catholicism flourished in England and permeated its national life, but in the very constitution of the Brotherhood of Charterhouse which bears the stamp, however faint, of the Catholic ideal of a lay community modernised. They must be widowers or bachelors,

celibates, must attend prayers in the chapel once a day, and dine together in the Hall at a stated hour. Leave to be absent from chapel or Hall must be obtained from the Master. The discipline, though now more lax, was more stringent in the early days when eighty old men of broken fortunes formed the Brotherhood. The Governors then cautioned one man that if he gave any further trouble he would be sent to Bridewell. They were forbidden to wear long hair, ruffs, feathers, and Russian-like apparel; from which it would appear that a form of Russophobia was epidemic in England long anterior to 1854 and onwards. A certain Captain Bell was ordered to make a public apology in the Great Hall on his bended knees before the Master for his misconduct, whatever his transgression may have been; a penalty which savours of a monastic penance. But, unlike a meek monk, this stiff-back Englishman refused, and was forthwith expelled. Another was expelled for "misprision of treason"; another for "coyning"; and yet another—*horribile dictu!*—for "being found a married man." The last named delinquent, Sir Robert Wingfield, was one of the 133 knights created by James I when, during his Coronation week he "lay at Charterhouse" in 1603. The accolade was given in the tapestry room, where hang rich Flemish designs, an adornment attributed to the Duke of Norfolk.

When Thomas Sutton, of Castle Camps, Cambridgeshire, the year he died, paid his £13,000 to Lord Suffolk for the London monastery of the Carthusians, he endowed the famous Hospital (more properly Hospice) and School for 80 old men and 40 boys with the revenues of upwards of twenty manors, lordships, and other estates in various parts of England. The institution is under the direction of the sovereign, fifteen governors, and the Master who receives a salary of £800 a year. The bas-relief on the founder's tomb, finished in 1615, represents the brothers assembled in chapel, while the founder lies beneath a full length effigy. Thackeray, in a well-known passage, describes it "with its grotesque carvings, monsters and heraldries," how it "darkles and shines with most wonderful shadows and lights. There he lies," says the English novelist, "*Fundator Noster*,

in his ruff and gown, awaiting the great Examination Day." Thackeray himself was a Charterhouse pupil and wrote *con amore*, making one of the most loveable of the creations of his fertile fancy, dear old Colonel Newcome, one of the brotherhood among whom he lived to the close of his unselfish life until he answered "adsum" for the last time. He regularly visited the school with his pockets well filled with ten-shilling pieces, which he was in the habit of distributing among the "grown boys." In the tapestry room until 1872—when the school was transferred to Godalming in Surrey, the scholastic portion of the premises being sold to the Merchant Taylors' School—the head grown boy, crowned monarch of the rest, was wont to deliver his annual Latin oration in praise of the founder. "We go to the chapel and have a sermon," wrote Thackeray, "after which we adjourn to a great dinner where old Condisciples meet, old toasts are given, and speeches are made." The rostrum from which these juvenile orators declaimed still stands, but somewhat shaky and the worse for usage.

Charterhouse is not only a link with the past, but its famous school is historical. It has had a succession of distinguished men as Masters and pupils. Among the latter it counts Richard Lovelace, the poet, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, two literary lights of what is called the golden age of English literature, three luminaries of the law, Judge Blackstone of the "Commentaries" and the two Chief Justices, Lords Ellenborough and Alverstone, the two historians Grote and Thirlwell, and among artists, John Leech and Sir Charles Eastlake. Leech's mother rented a room overlooking the playground, so that she could see that her boy did not get into too much mischief. In a passage leading to the chapel are tablets recording the names and fame of pupils who have won renown in the army or navy, in law, literature, learning and art. One, recently erected by Oscar Straus, an American citizen, is sure to arrest the attention of Transatlantic visitors. It is to Roger Williams, the founder of the State of Rhode Island, whom an inscription lauds as "the pioneer of religious liberty." Eminent sculptors like Flaxman and Chantney have employed

their best skill in adorning the tombs of deceased Charterhouse worthies in the chapel itself.

The Brotherhood, too, has had its associations with English literature, for Charterhouse harboured Archibald Macbean, Dr. Johnson's amanuensis when he was compiling his ponderous dictionary, and Elkanah Settle, the last "City Poet," who rivalled, or was flattered into fancying he was a rival of Dryden. Since its foundation Sutton's Hospital has been a haven of rest and refuge to between two and three thousand "decayed gentlemen" who have found shelter under its roof. If it is no longer a home of prayer, if its chapel no longer echoes to the chaunting of psalms entoned by monks, if it has for over three centuries and a half ceased to be identified with monasticism, which has conferred so many benefits upon every country in Europe, if it is no longer hallowed by saintly men who would march to martyrdom rather than recognise a spiritual supremacy in a lay sovereign or a Parliament-made Church, it may be admitted that it is a monument of the praiseworthy benevolence of a good citizen of London. The idea has been fairly well seized and expressed in the following graceful lines on the tercentenary which appeared over the signature "H. I. R." in the *Westminster Gazette*:

"A cell of stone lies on the mountain side
Where Bruno dwelt and wedded poverty
A solitary monk, resigning liberty
With other five, and by him all the pride
Of opulent Cologne was put aside—
Two hundred convents rose from out that cell
Where still we hear the monastery bell:

In our vast city still the tones abide.
The monks were exiled. Sutton founded Homes
For aged men in Charterhouse, for youth
Free place of learning until Manhood comes.
Such was the work the saintly Bruno wrought,
Such was the glorious flaming Light of Truth
From Desert,³ to our Wilderness⁴ he brought."

R. F. O'CONNOR.

³ La Grande Chartreuse.

⁴ The Garden and Wilderness Row, London, E. C.

THE JEWISH SECT OF THE NEW COVENANT AT DAMASCUS.

Once more we are in presence of a Hebrew document of rare interest, one produced from the same source from which a considerable part of the text of Ecclesiasticus was brought to light, namely, the Genizah at Cairo. M. Schechter, who conceived the happy idea of bringing about the discovery, is entitled to a still more uncommon merit in having made it known with a complete array of rabbinical lore of the very highest order.¹

But how could this document have become the companion of a text so honored as that of Ecclesiasticus? By the very fact of its having been cast into the Genizah, for the Genizah is a sacred receptacle both for the sacred books no longer in use, which may there be safeguarded from profanation, and for other books which pass for dangerous. It has been somewhat wittily described as serving "the twofold purpose of keeping good things from harm and bad things from harming."² In the estimation of orthodox Jews of Cairo, the document in question belongs beyond a doubt to the harmful class.

In our day, as formerly, the Jews are divided into two parties. The majority, constituting almost the entire nation, are grouped about the rabbis who have fallen heirs to the teachings of the Pharisees as contained in the Talmud and numerous other works more or less closely related to the Bible. But here and there are found synagogues of the Karaites who unhesitatingly reject all Pharisaic and rabbinical traditions. Anan, their spiritual ancestor, inaugurated in the very heart of Judaism a sort of

¹ Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Vol. I, Fragments of a Zadokite Work, edited . . . by S. Schechter, Cambridge, at the University Press, 1910. The documents consist of two MSS. on parchment, one containing sixteen pages the other two, and dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries.

² *Jewish Encyclopedia*, v, 612.

Protestant worship of the Letter which was to yield to no authority but Scripture. Like all heretics he pretended to have had forerunners who constituted a chain of tradition *without traditions*, and by thus opposing himself to the Pharisees, he deemed it natural to attach himself to the other great party of Judaism, the Sadducees. He even cited in his favor certain Sadducean works and it seems that the document of the Genizah is one of them. On this feature hinges the whole interest of the discovery. May it indeed be that we have recovered a Hebrew document written in the same spirit as the Talmud but which, because of its higher antiquity, reflects the state of mind of a part of Jewish society contemporary with our Lord? A problem like this cannot fail to impassionate theologians and historians alike. It has already set ink flowing in abundance. The present paper proposes only to sketch the elements of solution.³

At first sight the document is far from appearing to err in anything from sound Israelitish orthodoxy. It affects an unstinted respect for the law. All the evils that have overwhelmed Israel it ascribes to headstrongness and disobedience to laws imposed by God. This reproach is insisted upon unceasingly and in a variety of ways. It is the *leitmotif* of the entire piece. It is also as everyone knows, the grievance most clearly articulated in the Scriptures. Its peculiarity here lies in its being addressed to persons of a certain class, who, unfortunately, are not designated by name. It is characteristic of this kind of literature, so like the apocalyptic, to lure by mysteriousness and to appeal directly to the minds of the initiated only. We, however, not being of this favored class, are constrained to direct our efforts towards lifting the veil by conjectures.

The adversaries that are represented as a stumbling-block to Israel are innovators who, without being free-thinkers, have made the law more or less illusory. They are individuals firm

³ For fuller details see the *Revue Biblique*, April, 1912, and nos. following.

in upholding the law as such, but who interpret it to suit themselves, and have changed everything to their own liking, whence the enigmatic description applied to them: "They build the wall and plaster it with parget." The words call to mind the striking contrasts, such as exist on the one hand, between those magnificent blocks of stone which compose the Temple structure, —splendid when beheld in their bare white courses, and on the other, an ashlar wall, hastily and irregularly built and then faced to conceal the defective workmanship. Instead of adhering to the law, the adversaries had fabricated an unsound system of observances the brilliancy of which failed to outshine its weaker points. What more like the Pharisees! They it was who mitigated and distorted certain commandments with a view to adapting the law to the varying necessities of life, the very crime which our reactionary conservatives judged irremissible. Chief among the guilty, ranks a man who seems identified with Falsehood. Might this not be a way of designating Bar Kokba, "son of the star," who was named by his foes Bar Koziba, or "son of lies"?

Happily, God had his watchful eye fixed upon Israel. In order to save it He held in reserve an élite of faithful servants to whom he revealed the true meaning of the Law. Needless to say, they were the spiritual brethren of the author of the document whom we may well name sectarians, since they aim at forming a distinct group within the nation, or an élite who pretend to be working out the destinies of Israel in troublous times. Let us grant them a hearing.

The document begins as follows:

"And now, listen, all you who know justice and understand the works of God, for He is contending with all flesh, and He will judge all those who despise Him; for, because of the unfaithful ones who have abandoned Him, He has hidden His face from Israel and from His sanctuary, and He has delivered them to the sword; but on remembering the covenant with the fathers, He left a remnant in Israel which He did not yield up to destruction in the time of wrath. Three hundred and ninety years^{*} after He had delivered them to Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon, He visited them and He caused to grow from Israel and Aaron, the root of

^{*}A number, probably symbolical, borrowed from *Ezech. iv, 5*.

a plant to possess His country and to make his soil prosperous. And they understood their sin, and they acknowledged their guilt, and they were for twenty years like the blind and like people who grope along the way, and God had regard to their works as they sought Him with a perfect heart, and He raised up for them a Teacher of justice to lead them into the way of His heart. . .⁵ . . . It is through them that God established His covenant with Israel forever by revealing to them the hidden things concerning which all Israel had gone astray: His holy Sabbaths and glorious feast-days. . .⁶ . . . And He built them a sure house in Israel,⁷ such as had never been erected before . . . as God had spoken through the ministry of Ezechiel: "The priests and the Levites, and the sons of Sadoc who kept watch over my sanctuary, while the children of Israel strayed far from me, they shall offer me fat and blood."⁸ The priests are the penitents of Israel who went out of the land of Juda, and the Levites are those who joined them, and the sons of Sadoc are the elect of Israel who shall rise up at the end of time.⁹

They¹⁰ who build the wall and are strong for the Law . . . have fallen into lust by taking two wives during life, while the principle of creation is: "male and female He created them."¹¹

On the other hand, God raised up Aaron from among the intelligent and wise men of Israel . . . the penitents of Israel who departed from the country of Juda and who settled in the country of Damascus, all whom God has named princes.¹² . . . But the men who entered into the new covenant in the country of Damascus, and afterwards rejected it . . . and separated themselves from the well of living waters, will not be counted in the council of the people, nor be inscribed in the book of God, from the day when the only Teacher was taken away, till the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel.¹³ As to those who shall have persevered in these counsels, they shall exult and rejoice, and in their heart will be strengthened and shall rule over all the sons of the world, and God will pardon them, and they shall see his salvation, for they have taken refuge in the shadow of His holy Name.¹⁴

The reader will have remarked a two-fold aspect of the sect. At the same time that it affects an inviolable respect for the law it has recourse to a special revelation for its authorization. Things have come to such a pass that it does not suffice to preach fidelity to the Law. A thorough reform is needed, and there is no shrinking back from the progressive term, "new covenant," which was perhaps suggested by Jeremias.¹⁵ Is this because

⁵ Page 1, lines i-ii.

⁶ P. 3, ll. 13-14.

⁷ II. Sam. II, 35.

⁸ Ezech. XLIV, 15.

⁹ P. 3, l. 19.

¹⁰ P. 4, l. 4.

¹¹ Gen. I, 27. P. 4, ll. 19-21.

¹² P. 6, ll. 2-6.

¹³ P. 19, l. 33 to p. 20, l. 1.

¹⁴ P. 20, ll. 33 ff.

¹⁵ Cfr. Jer. XXXIV, 10.

the new times predicted by the Prophet had arrived? Has God really sent the Prophet announced by Moses? Or had the Messiah appeared in Israel after the manner of Balaam's star to guide it to more glorious horizons? Without that, how can one have dreamt of a "new covenant"? What right was there to meddle with the covenant concluded with Abraham and Moses?

The solution offered by the sect is not clear. Facts all too evident had prevented within its bosom a consciousness of having already entered into Messianic glory. On the other hand, the sect could not have arisen but through the influence of a man whose genius was decidedly religious, of one who had already died and who was not therefore the Messiah.

Parenthetically it may be remarked here that the document brought to light from the Genizah at Cairo is a new proof of the difficulty there was in passing for the Messiah without being authorized by God and it shows us the degree in which Christ's resurrection is the seal of His work. If the Apostles had not seen the Savior risen, Jesus could not have been characterized as "doctor of justice," nor could anybody have applied to him the title of *Messias*.

Yet that is what took place with the founder of the sect. He was styled the singular Doctor the Star which conducted the sect to the country of Damascus. He may even be more or less vaguely the Messiah . . . but it is not in him that the people hope. There is nothing in him to indicate that he is to come again. The expected One is he who will put an end to the time of trial and misfortune. He is the Messiah of Aaron and Israel.

There is another peculiarity of our sectarians. They await the Messiah undaunted. Those days have passed when criticism might have asked if Israel associated everything of importance with the Messiah. Yet, strange to say, the Messiah, doctor of justice, is not, in their view, to be born of David and of Juda, but of Aaron and of Israel. Our document leaves no doubt on the matter. David had transgressed the Law by taking so many wives and his whole palliation is that he did

not know the Law! As for Juda, the sect has separated from him and left him in order to settle near Damascus, the separation being irrevocable. Even at the moment of national restoration when the twelve dreamed of re-uniting, as of old, nothing was to be feared from Juda. The stand had been taken, the spirit of the sect refused pardon, and in doing so it bolstered itself up on the authority of Micheas.¹⁶

The Messiah then is to be born of Israel and Aaron. Must one understand by that that he is to come from the tribe of Levi? No, for hope must nowhere be discouraged, save perhaps outside the sect. Of this, Aaron and Israel are taken precisely as a very noble designation. It is composed of priests and laity from one of whom the Messiah shall very certainly go forth yet it is not so certain that he shall spring from a priestly race. No description of his reign is furnished. Mention is several times made of the coming of a Messiah but that will be at the close of history and at the end of the world. Nothing is said of what will then occur, except that the Jews of the sect will rule the entire world. As for the rest, the Messiah will be all-powerful. In no passage is it asserted that for each individual there will be another life in which chastisement and reward will be meted out.

But what transpires during the interval? While waiting for the Messiah the sect organizes with the Law as its natural basis. Logically, no one could add to it without becoming like those who "build the wall and spread the parget." Yet everyone is aware that no reform has been able to extricate itself from this contradiction. The sectarians reject all traditions to adhere to the Word of God in its purity, and straightway they write commentaries on it, they regulate life according to their manner of understanding it, they inaugurate a theological system with jurisprudence and new traditions. Our author has accordingly been unable to escape the rôle of legislator, and the rigor of his principle has drawn him to place himself in opposition to the Law. His reasoning against the Pharisees was not bad when

¹⁶ P. 4, l. 11.

he forbade marriage between an uncle and a niece on the ground that according to the Law, an aunt was prohibited to marry her nephew. Yet he exceeds the old Law, through preference for the newer one by interdicting bigamy and apparently repudiation. Ordinarily he is more strict than the Pharisees themselves, particularly on the article of the Sabbath. For example, should a man fall into the water on the Sabbath day, one can help to rescue him if he can do so easily, but if the use of a ladder, a cord, or any instrument is necessary,—all the worse for the unfortunate man! It has ever been contended that, after the manner of the Essenes, our sectarians were obliged to refrain even from natural necessities on the Sabbath. The belief seems better founded that they were called upon simply to lay aside their work at the sound of the trumpet announcing the Sabbath, just as many a holy religious who has been known to leave a letter half formed at the stroke of the bell. Naturally, great stress was laid on the necessity of avoiding defilement. The blood of animals was forbidden to all Israelites. The prohibitoion was now extended to the blood of fish, a food which the Pharisees were accustomed to tolerate.

To maintain such strict observance it was of great import to draw tight and firmly the lines of discipline. Our sectarians were divided into minor communities, which were not to be too large, lest fervor should be imperiled, nor too small, lest they should be invaded by the spirit of the world. They were to contain no fewer than ten and no more than a thousand members. This last figure proves that the communities did not possess convents, much less, convents of celibates like the Essenes. They were rather normal groups, the authority over which was vested in a priest and lay inspector, assisted by a council of ten persons embracing four priests or Levites and six of the laity. The priest was charged with the religious instruction which was to be given either according to the Law and the Prophets, or according to a book peculiar to the sect named the Book of Hegou. This title remains up to the present unexplained. The inspector's office was to provide for justice, peace, the help of the poor and afflicted. He might

broadly be compared to a bishop, were it not that his duties were exclusively of a civil nature. The document continues to speak of sacrifices as if they were being offered in reality, yet this may be only a reminiscence of the time when the Temple of Jerusalem was abandoned and victims were still immolated. Proselytes were sought, but with marked discretion. It was to the interest of the society to surround itself with mystery, the purpose of which was doubtless to predispose its members to persevere, because of the importance of the secret. In this there was a striking similarity with apocryphal literature whose origin is also concealed. Our document cites the "Book of Jubilees," which is known only through an Ethiopic version, the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," which has reached us largely interspersed with Christian interpolations, and even the books of Jeremias to Baruch and of Eliseus to Giezi the very names of which were unknown.

Such are the more general features of the document drawn from the Genizah at Cairo, whose physiognomy has been well sketched by M. Schechter.

We are now prepared to inquire into the historical name of the sect of "the new covenant" established at Damascus, as well as the time of its separation from the principal throne of Israel. Unfortunately, it is no easy task to dispel the darkness enveloping these questions.

It has been volunteered that the "new covenant" is our own, the one founded by Jesus Christ. The term invites the identification, but beyond the term there is scarcely anything in common between the Jewish sect, more Jewish indeed than the Pharisees, and the spirit of the Gospels. It has been alleged that the sect had only one Teacher and his respect for marriage has been pointed out. But the Teacher in belonging to the past is not the Messiah since the latter is still represented as the object of expectation. As for the marriage-tie, there were already existent here and there in Judaism traces of a greater respect than the school of Hillel had shown it, and when our Savior proclaimed its indissolubility, it was to a text of Genesis

that he appealed, the very text which is called to mind in our document.

It is true that certain Jewish converts to Christianity continued the practice of Mosaic observance. Sts. Epiphanius and Jerome knew them under the name of Nazarenes. They inhabited Syria, Berea (today Aleppo), and Cocaba which was probably in the vicinity of Damascus. But the Nazarenes made profession, at least, that Jesus Christ was the Messiah and they had a Gospel much like that of St. Matthew, whereas our sectarians are completely within the horizon of Mosaic religion. If they have received a revelation it concerns only the true sense of the Law of Moses; if one enters into a "new covenant" in being affiliated to their society, it is only by taking an oath of absolute fidelity to that Law, while their hostility to Juda is irreconcilable with the Davidic origin which Christians recognize in the Savior.

It will be more natural to compare the sect at Damascus with the Samaritans. Like the Samaritans they had broken away from Juda and Jerusalem; like the Samaritans they had been guided in their exodus by schismatical priests. The Samaritans are awaiting a Messiah who is to spring from their midst and be called "Taheb" (the restorer); the sect looks forward to a Messiah from Aaron and Israel. The situations are very much alike, as are those of all schisms which keep to old beliefs after sacrificing unity. The two schisms would be identical only in the case of their having the same point of departure inasmuch as their doctrines might be characteristic of the moment of rupture. But nothing of the kind occurs, for while the Samaritans admit the Pentateuch and the book of Josue as canonical and inspired Scriptures, our sectarians cite willingly and in addition to them the Prophets, in whom they acknowledge an authority as great as do the compilers of the Talmud; yet they are less rigorous than the Talmudists in discarding apocryphal writings. From this it results that they left the Holy City at a time when the Canon of the Scriptures embraced the Prophets, that is, later than the Samaritans. That they were formed like the latter and displayed the same

hostility towards official Judaism, were but the natural consequences of their schismatical position. This resemblance, however, is rather negative and does not go so far as to adopt Gerizim as a sanctuary competitive with Jerusalem.

On the other hand, it is not allowable to think of too merry a sect as were the Karaites. The Karaites, owing to their aversion for Pharisaic traditions could not welcome apocryphal works very graciously. We must here apply the criterion just spoken of, according to which the sectarians of Damascus have been placed earlier than the condemnation of the apocrypha. And still, certain analogies in detail with the legislation of the Karaites are not lacking. Since indeed, Anan and the first founders of the Karaites built up their system on anterior writings, there is no room for doubting that they used works similar in character to the one to which our fragment belongs. These writings were styled Sadducean, a fact that seems to justify our query in the beginning: "Have we in hand a relic of Sadducean literature?" If we have it would be all the more precious for being alone of its kind.

When Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus, the entire Jewish structure gave way in general disaster. Holy Scripture and its interpreters survived. The Sadducees, as we learn from the New Testament and the writings of Josephus, were engaged for the most part in temporal affairs. The party derived its strength from the priesthood, the high-priest being its chief, although it had associated with it a few influential families. The priesthood was doomed to disappear with the Temple, since sacrifice offered elsewhere than on Mt. Moriah would have been sacrilegious, and with this reverse of fortune the aristocracy lost its influence. It is also possible that the Sadducees wrote little. Their principal grievance against the Pharisees was the ever increasing number of decisions relative to jurisprudence, to which the doctors gave the force of Law, and the new dogmas they continued to impose upon the people. For such a state of mind the written Law was sufficient. The Sadduces are represented, indeed, as men of strong minds, imbued with Greek culture and not overzealous for their religion,

but the statement is only half true. It would be more accurate to describe them as a great religious and political party that held aloof from such schools as were effectually closed against distractions from without and exclusively intent upon their own theoretical conceptions. In contact with the government and associated in the administration, the Sadduces followed the various influences and fashions of society. This made them of worldly repute by almost hellenizing them under the Syrian kings, making them zealous for religion under the first Asmoneans, and causing them to court the friendship of Rome under Herod. But after the reactionary Macchabean movement in favor of religion they are not known to have again fallen into the laxism of Jason and Menalaus, the two willing instruments of the Syrian kings in their endeavor to force the Jews into apostasy from their natural religion.

One may therefore, without too little likelihood, ascribe to this party a document like that in question, which implicitly denounces Pharisean novelties, is much attached to the priesthood and which seems even, precisely like the Sadducees, to have chosen the title "son of Sadoc" as a designation for its adherents. The extreme zeal displayed in the document for the Law indicates nothing to the contrary.

In the New Testament one sees in a general way that the princes of the priests were no less zealous than the Pharisaic doctors, in the strife with Jesus and the apostles. If indeed they appear to have tempted our Savior less often by ensnaring Him in His speech, they labored none the less energetically to repress Him, as was their wont on similar occasions. It was Gamaliel, the chief of the Pharisees, who advised moderation in the Sanhedrim when the leaders were bent on a summary extirpation of Christianity to its very roots.¹⁷ It may be objected that the Sadducees admitted only the Pentateuch, since Jesus refrained from citing the Prophets to them in the controversy about the resurrection of the dead. Yet it is by no means proved that they rejected the Prophets. The Law

¹⁷ Acts of the Apostles, v, 34 ff.

was *par excellence* their canonical book and directive authority. The same rôle is accorded it in the "new covenant" of Damascus. There seems then to be no alternative but to classify our document as Sadducean. Yet this must be done cautiously.

We have recognized in the document a double physiognomy. In certain respects it is very conservative, and it is animated by an enthusiasm that ordinarily accompanies explosive religious movements. The combination of these two phenomena is not altogether unheard of. Besides the institutions that spring into existence like a new creation, there is the "revival"; and the latter exhibits as much imaginativeness and poetic transport as sects newly founded. Very conservative minds can be subject to revelations, prophecy and religious manifestations of every kind. This was the case, if it is permissible to recall it, of the partisans of legitimism in France. As long as there was hope that the Count of Chambord would ascend the throne, many a prediction was put into circulation, among others, the famous prophecy of Orval.

But this not the procedure of great political parties organized in broad daylight. The Sadducees, even without being strong minded or free thinkers, were not disposed to see supernatural manifestations everywhere. They even denied the existence of spirits, and we know from the history of Christianity itself their extreme hostility towards every religious innovation. Now our sectarians were the disciples of a special Teacher; they pretended to have been favored with revelations; they admitted apocryphal books, and as it seems, they placed them on the same footing as inspired writings. They are not then the historic Sadducees, such as we know them. What remains to be said but that they are a branch broken off from the Sadducean party who must have taken birth at a time when the priesthood was being renewed in its fervor, namely, at the Maccabean uprising?

While the leaders of the Party, the highpriests and grand lords, were gliding into the worldly atmosphere of the court, a small group preserved unalloyed its primitive ardor by saturating its energy in Messianic hope. But, drawn with the

majority of the party under Asmonean influence, it lost sight of the very clear prophecies which made the Messiah David's heir. Perhaps they reasoned that the prevarication of the former kings had worn out God's patience and that thenceforth the priest-kings of the Macchabean family had fallen heirs to the promises made to David concerning his throne. Analogous tendencies have already been observed in the Book of Jubilees and in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; tendencies—mark well!—for when those two books had been written the rupture with Juda had not been consummated, and that tribe was still in the enjoyment of its privileges.

What events could have conspired to have turned a pious, severe and enthusiastic group filled with hope, into a schismatical body that turned its back on the nation? The perversion seems to have been accomplished when the nation had no longer any other leaders but Pharisees, in whom the sectarians were accustomed to see avowed enemies. So long as the priesthood preserved its prerogatives and its official rank with a certain amount of influence over the populace, the Sadducees, because of this elevation, guarded patience. But the virtue failed them when they were obliged to submit to the yoke of those whom they directly charged with being the cause of Jerusalem's downfall. In the midst of the national disturbances following the ruin of the Temple, their spirit, which beheld in the disaster a great chastisement from the Lord, endeavored to command the situation once more. To a great evil they resolved to oppose a great remedy. Instead of being guided by the doctors of untruth, whose only art, for them, lay in plastering the breaches with roughcast, they felt called upon to practice an unlimited observance of the Law and to live in isolation, or else run the risk of ceasing to be the small remnant destined to perpetuate the hope of Israel.

The schism, therefore, according to all appearances, broke out subsequently to the capture of Jerusalem by Titus (70 A. D.). It could not have been much later, for the doctrine is written in very correct Hebrew, more classic than the Mishnah (which

dates from about 200, A. D.) and it originated before sacrifices had ceased to be offered in the sanctuary of the Holy City. Now we know that, although the Temple was utterly destroyed and razed to the ground by Titus, the altar was re-erected by Bar Kokba who had a high-priest associated with himself in the first year of his revolt under Hadrian (135 A. D.). This war, which is so little known, was positively a Messianic war, since its hero took the name of "Son of the Star" (Bar Kokba) and was recognized as Messiah by Aquiba, the greatest authority of Judaism. It resulted in atrocious repression, and annihilated forever the aspirations of Israel for independence. Then it was, I imagine, that our little Sadducean group, without awaiting the end of the tragic adventure, broke definitively with the Pharisees, with Juda whom they had brought to ruin, and with Juda's false Messiah, the man of lies who had seduced Israel. This is only a conjecture, but perhaps another discovery in a Genizah yet unknown will tell what it is worth.

JOSEPH BARNES, O. P.

TWO NOTES ON THE APOCALYPSE.

1. ITS GREEK TEXT.

The ordinary Greek text of the *Apocalypse* is in an unhappy state. For his edition in 1516, Erasmus used only the cursive 1, of the twelfth century. This lacked the last six verses of the book, so the scholar translated them into Greek from the Latin Vulgate; and some of his words still remain in the commonly received text. In other places, as Miller's *Scrivener*, ii. 184, notes, the difficulty of distinguishing between the text and the commentary in the manuscript, led him to supply phrases by translating them from the Latin.

To restore the original text, we have only six uncials, that is, manuscripts in half-capitals or majuscules. Of these, the ninth-century Kosinitsan, *Gimel*, is still unedited. The whole of the *Apocalypse* is found in the Sinaitic, *Aleph*, probably of Caesarea and the year 331, in the Alexandrian, *A*, of Alexandria and the early fifth century, probably about 431, and in the Vatican *Q*, of the eighth century, about 800. Two uncials, the Ephraem palimpsest, *C*, of Egypt and the fifth century, and the Porphyrian palimpsest, *P*, of the ninth century, are incomplete. These five manuscripts present more than 1600 various readings in the 404 verses, to say nothing of mere differences in spelling. But, besides these uncials, we have early versions and writers, and 223 manuscripts in the cursive or minuscule form, which was used for this purpose from the ninth century.

In the ordinary treatment of such material, we distinguish ancient types of text, and classify the witnesses according to that which they most resemble. There is the Western Text, characterised by interpolations. This belongs to the second century, and is generally represented by the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, and all the earliest writers in Christendom. Then

there is the Alexandrian Text, which we may regard as arising between the year 231, when Origen left Alexandria for Caesarea, and the year 331, when Eusebius of Caesarea provided fifty manuscripts for Constantine. This type is marked by grammatical corrections and the smoothing of phrases.

The Syrian text contains readings which are not found in any writer before 250. It belonged to Cyrian Antioch, and is generally associated with the name of Lucian, martyred in 312. Whether it is the result of two revisions or of only one, it represents the official text, which passed from Antioch through Constantinople to the world. It is marked by conflation, as it often solves a question of two variants by combining both as far as possible. For example, in *Apoc.* xvi. 17, there are the two Greek words, τοῦ ναοῦ, which should be rendered "of the Sanctuary," and not "of the Temple." They form the true text, which is supported by the Alexandrian uncial, as well as by other witnesses. As that Sanctuary is in heaven, some substituted "of the heaven" for "of the Sanctuary." And therefore, we find τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in some cursives, and translated into the Armenian version. The two variants are combined in the phrase "of the Sanctuary of the heaven" by the Vatican manuscript, *Q*, and the commentary of Arethas, both these witnesses representing the Syrian text here as elsewhere.

Westcott and Hort, in their *Greek Testament*, ii. § 154, confess the peculiar difficulty of distinguishing these texts in the case of the *Apocalypse*. They indeed miss the guidance of the Vatican B, which does not contain this book; and everyone must feel restrained by the small number of the witnesses. Further, the work contains many short clauses with similar endings, so that a scribe, having copied one such ending and looking back to the manuscript, might easily light upon the second occurrence of the form, the intervening words being omitted. This error of *homoloteleuton*, or "similar ending," is found in all our witnesses.

But a still greater difficulty is occasioned by the way in which the texts, Western, Alexandrian and Syrian, are mixed in the same manuscripts. This is especially the case in the

cursives of the commentary, which Cappadocian Andrew composed about 550 A. D. So it is only with qualifications that we can hold the Western Text of the *Apocalypse* to be represented by the Porphyrian *P* or Cent. ix., the Andrew text, about 20 cursives and the Old Latin; the Alexandrian text, by the Sinaitic *Aleph* of Cent. iv., the Alexandrian *A* and Ephraem *C*, both of Cent. v., the Latin Vulgate, the Egyptian and Syriac versions, and nearly all early writers; and the Syriac text, by the Vatican *Q*, of Cent. viii., the Cappadocian Arethas about 900 A. D., and about 30 cursives.

If we could, it would be our business to get behind the Western, Alexandrian and Syrian texts. It would carry us to an early date in the second century, if we succeeded in tracing the Old Latin, Syriac and Bohairic versions to the point, at which they diverged. The epistle of the churches in Lyons and Vienne, written in 177 A. D., and preserved by Eusebius in his *History*, v, i., implies an Old Latin version like that of Africa. The Egyptian Bohairic may reasonably be dated about 200 or 250 A. D.; and the Egyptian Sahidic appears to have been made about 188. But unfortunately, we are dependent for the Syriac of the *Apocalypse* on Gwynn's Philoxenian version of 508, and on the Hareclean Syriac of 616, which represents the book in our copies of the Syriac Vulgate or Peshitta.

It is necessary in this connection to remember how closely Rome, Carthage, Alexandria, Syrian Antioch and Edessa were related. Even in Egypt, as we can learn from *Gallandi*, v, p. viii., there were very many Latin monks, who knew neither Coptic nor Greek. Coptic does indeed include many Latin words, such as *phossa*, that is, *fossa*, *doux*, that is, *dux*, *strata*, *Biktōr* for *Victor*, and *paganos* for *paganus*. But the position of Alexandria as a granary of Rome, and the direct connection by coast-service between Alexandria and Syrian Antioch, or even by just 800 miles of coast-road, besides the close relation between Rome and Carthage, and that between Syrian Antioch and Edessa, are perhaps sufficient to explain an early com-

mingling of the versions without assuming as Hoskier does, in his treatise *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version*, p. 110, a triglot in Greek, Syriac and Latin, and a tetraglot in Greek, Syriac, Latin and Coptic.

In our effort to classify the witnesses, we commence with the Latin Vulgate, and determine its text by means of the manuscripts, Fuldensis, of 540 A. D., Amiatinus, just before 716, Toletanus, of Cent. viii., Harleianus, of Cent. ix., Demidovianus, of Cent. xii., the Lipsienses ^{4, 5, 6}, of Centuries xiv. and xv., and the Clementine edition of 1592. Then, representing these witnesses by the signs for them, we present the resultant testimony of Fuld Am Tol Harl Demid Lipss ^{4, 5, 6}, as simply Vg.

In determining the Old Latin text, we must deal with much material, which needs delicate handling. There are 205 quotations from the *Apocalypse* in Tertullian, who became a Christian about 195 A. D., but quotes irregularly. 188 are found in Hippolytus, who preached before Origen at Rome in 211. Then we have St. Cyprian's *Testimonies against the Jews* in 248, the commentary on the *Apocalypse* by Victorinus of Pannonian Pettau about 290, and that by the Donatist and African Tyconius about 390. The commentary of Victorinus exists in two forms. The shorter, in De la Bigne's *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vi., is really a revision by St. Jerome, who had published his Latin Vulgate of the *Apocalypse* in 385, and now used the work of Tyconius in editing Victorinus. This shorter form was again revised, and afterwards expanded into the longer form, which we find in Migne's *Latin Fathers*, v. At the end of the fourth century, besides Tyconius, St. Jerome's *Vulgate* and his *Victorinus*, we have the Latin translation of *St. Irenaeus* with 65 quotations from the *Apocalypse*. St. Augustine follows Victorinus and Tyconius, and has many references to the *Apocalypse*, especially in his *City of God*, finished in 426 A. D. About the year 550, we have three commentators, carrying on the same tradition and text. These are the Spanish Apringius, the Roman Cassiodorus, and the African Primasius. And in the seventh century, there is the purely African Latin text of the Fleury or Floriacensis palimpsest, h.

The commentary of Bede, who died in 735, is printed in Migne's *Latin Fathers*, xcv. The Benedictine Ambrose Ansbart completed his commentary in Italy about 767, and the Spanish Benedictine Beatus wrote his about 785. In the same eighth century comes the treatise *on the Divine Scriptures*, wrongly attributed to St. Augustine. This, the *Speculum* or "Mirror," denoted by m, seems to present a Spanish form of the Old Latin Version. In the ninth century, there are Haymo of Halberstadt, to be found in Migne's *Latin Fathers*, cxviii., Alcuin, Berengaudus, and Walafrid Strabo. The commentators in the twelfth century include the famous Joachim of Calabria, Richard of St. Victor, Anselm of Havelberg, Anselm of Loan, Bruno of Asti, and Rupert of Deutz. In the thirteenth, there is the *Gigas* manuscript, g, representing a late European form of the Old Latin, like that in the Sardinian Lucifer. In the same period, there are Albert the Great, Hugo de S. Caro, Peter John Oliva, and a commentary wrongly attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas. In the fourteenth century, we find Nicolas of Gorham and Nicolas of Lyra.

To these we must add the homilies the *Apocalypse* in Migne's *Latin Fathers*, xxxv, and at the end of vol. iii. in the Benedictine edition of *St. Augustine*. These may be regarded as representing the text and commentary of Tyconius, and are quoted as anon^{aug}.

For practical purposes, we determine the Old Latin text of the *Apocalypse* by h m g Tert Hipp Cyp Vict Iren^{lat} Aug Prim Cassiod Haym anon^{aug}, and denote the resultant as *It*, that is, the *Itala* of Tischendorf's nomenclature.

To reach the early Syriac text, we are dependent upon Gwynn's copy of the Philoxenian version, S, and upon the Harelean version, *Sigma*, which represents the *Apocalypse* in the Syriac Vulgate. But the Philoxenian version was made in 508 and the Harelean in 616. Elsewhere the Armenian version contains some Old Syriac readings; but according to Zohrab, in his Armenian Bible of 1805, the Armenian version of the *Apocalypse* was not made before the eighth century. The Syriac text, then, is represented by two versions, the Philoxenian in the sixth century and the Harelean in the seventh.

The Armenian belongs to the eighth. Then there are two families of Greek cursives, which support the Philoxenian Syriac. Six of these are so alike that they may be regarded as representing one witness. Of these, 70 and 94 belong to Cent. xiv., and 25, 58, 78, and 84 to Cent. xv. They may all be represented by 70. The cursives in the second family also are late. These may be represented by 80; and they include 79, 80 and 100, of Cent. xiv., 21, 28, 73, and 101, of Cent. xv., and 79^a and 182, of Cent. xvi. Then there is a related group, which Hoskier has named the Erasmian, because it contains 1, the cursive used by Erasmus. It includes 1, of Cent. xii., 67, of Cent. xiv., 46, 59, 62, 88, 109, of Cent. xv., and 63 and 72, of Cent. xvi.

Turning now to Egypt, we find 11 quotations in Clement, head of the Alexandrian School in 189 A. D., and 165 in Origen, who succeeded him in 203. Hoskier, in his great work on the Bohairic Version, dates it in 200 or 250 A. D., p. 1, and accepts 188 A. D., as the date of the Sahidic Gospels, p. 117. So we have St. Clement and the Sahidic about 189, Origen and the Bohairic about 200. Then the Sinaitic uncial, *Aleph*, probably appears at Palestinian Caesarea in 331. The Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C belong to the fifth century. And a small but independent group of Greek cursives belong to Egypt. It includes 34 and 68, of Cent. xi., and 35 and 87, of Cent. xiv.

There are single cursives of importance, such as 95, of Cent. xi., 36 and 56, of Cent. xiii., and 32 of Cent. xv.

As to the uncials, the Vatican Q and the Porphyrian P, the former belongs with Arethas to the eighth century and the Syrian text. The latter is of the ninth century, and represents a mixture of the Western and Alexandrian texts. These two concur in only about fifty instances against the united testimony of the Sinaitic *Aleph*, the Alexandrian A, and the Ephraem C.

2. ITS GREEK GRAMMAR.

The grammatical style of the *Apocalypse* is influenced by the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, by the Greek Vulgate or Septuagint, by a Greek version like the later edition by Theo-

dotion, and by the insertion of explanatory notes by the writer. It is also affected by the ecstatic condition of the prophet. So the result cannot be simply described as a specimen of the Common Dialect. It is not to be classed with Biblical Greek, nor with the everyday language of the papyrus letters, much less with the more formal styles of inscriptions and papyrus contracts. It is a speech of its own kind.

For example, the feminine word *ῥίς*, "a rainbow," though it is feminine, as in x. 1, is followed in iv. 3, by the masculine form, *ὅμοιος*, "like"; but that is because the latter word is used for the Hebrew prefix, *k*, "as," without reference to gender. In xii. 5, "a boy" is expressed by "a son, a male," the word "male" being neuter; but the expression represents the Hebrew *bēn zākhār*. The Greek genitive absolute is never used in the book, ix. 9 being no exception. The use of the preposition *ἐκ*, "out of," after the verb *ἐκδικεῖν*, "to avenge," may of course be due to the *ἐκ*, prefixed to the verb; and the ordinary construction is with *ἀπό*, "from"; but some would explain the *ἐκ* by the Hebrew preposition *min*, "from," which follows *nāqām*, "to avenge." Certainly, we should not explain the *μετὰ* and genitive, that is "with," used with *ἀκολουθεῖν*, "to follow," in vi. 8, by the *achār*, "behind," "after," used with the Hebrew *hālākh*, "to go."

We note also that St. John uses *Ἱερουσαλὴμ* for "Jerusalem" in the *Apocalypse*, not *Ἱεροσόλυμα*, as in the *Gospel*, the former being adopted from the Greek Vulgate or Septuagint. Similarly, in the *Apocalypse*, the seer employs the intensive *ἰδοὺ* of the Greek Vulgate and the middle voice, we accenting it as an adverb, *ἰδοὺ* in place of the less impressive *ἴδε*, "behold"; and he adopts other words and phrases, such as *παντοκράτωρ* for "almighty" and *ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου* for "the tabernacle of testimony," from the same source.

We need not take account of the nominative case in place of the vocative, of the plural for the dual, or of the accusative case to mark a point of time. Such forms do not make the *Apocalypse* singular in its grammar.

With regard to the relation between nouns, the nominative *ὁ μάρτυς*, "the witness," appears at first sight to be in appo-

sition to the genitive Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, "of Jesus Christ," in i. 5. A similar construction is found in the nominative participle, ἡ καταβαίνουσα, "the descending," or "which is descending," this following the genitive τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, "the fresh Jerusalem," in iii. 12, and again in the nominative plural, οἱ τηροῦντες, "who are keeping," after the genitive τῶν ἁγίων, "of the holy [ones]," in xiv. 12. There are other examples, some of them doubtful as true readings. But the author knows the rules of apposition, as he shews in many cases, such as iv. 9, vi. 1, vii. 1, and viii. 13. As to his apparent breaches of rule, we can see in such cases as iii. 12, and xiv. 12, that the break in the construction is due to St. John's insertion of an explanatory note, the grammar in the gloss being independent of that in the text.

We may also draw attention to the change of genitive into accusative in xvii. 4, and to the change of the nominative into the accusative in vii. 9 and x. 8.

As to the relation between noun and adjective, we find the noun ληνός, "a wine-vat," which is indeed masculine or feminine in Attic Greek, used with a feminine article, and afterwards defined by the masculine expression, τὸν μέγαν, "the great," xiv. 19. In iv. 1, we find the feminine φωνή, "a voice," followed by the masculine λέγων, "saying"; but the latter word is evidently a "formula of quotation," and represents the Hebrew *lê'môr*, "to say," or "saying," this being a gerundival form, composed of the preposition *l*, "to," and the construct form of the infinitive in the Qal or simple conjugation of *emôr*, "to say." The compound form was represented in the Septuagint by λέγων or λέγοντες, that is, "saying" in the singular or plural. In vi. 9, 10, the feminine accusative, τὰς ψυχάς, "the souls," is followed by the masculine nominative, λέγοντες, "saying." In ix. 13, the feminine φωνήν is followed by the masculine λέγοντα, "saying." But the author well knows the gender of φωνή, "a voice," and of ψυχή, "a soul," and gives them feminine adjectives in vi. 10, and xvi. 3. Apparently, the treatment of λέγων, "saying," is extended to ἔχων, having, in x. 2, xiv. 14, and xxi. 14.

We may also note the masculine participle ἐστῶτες, "standing," used with feminine nouns in xi. 4, and the masculine participle γέμοντα "being full of," used with the neuter form θηρίον, "a wild-beast," in xvii. 3, to represent the monster as a personal power.

As to the connection of nouns with verbs, we find neuter plurals with plural verbs in iii. 4, xi. 13, 18, xv. 4; but the rule is known, for such nouns are followed by singular verbs in ii. 27, viii. 3, xiii. 14, xiv. 13, xvi. 14, xix. 14. Both the rule and the exception are found in i. 19. There is the same rule and similar exceptions in the Greek Vulgate of the Seventy. The rule is there illustrated by *Ezekiel* xxxviii. 10, and the exceptions by *Ezekiel* xxxix. 7, *Nahum* ii. 5, iii. 10, *Zechariah* ii. 11, x. 7, xii. 3. But it is easy to understand that a plural verb would follow a neuter plural, when that, as in *Xenophon's Anabasis*, VII. iii. 11, 1 *Cor.* i. 27, 28, *Eph.* ii. 14, and *Heb.* vii. 7, is used of persons in a general sense.

Then as to the connection of nouns and prepositions, some regard the repetition of the preposition in a series of nouns, as for example in xvi. 13, as something unusual; but we find the same thing often enough in the Greek Vulgate of the prophets, as for example in *Zechariah* i. 4, 6, vi. 10, 14, viii. 7. Then the preposition ἀπό, "from," requires the genitive; but it is followed in i. 4, by a phrase in the nominative. This expression is the well-known, "He who is and the [One who] was and the Coming One." So it is plainly intended that the whole phrase be taken as one word, and as an indeclinable noun. The preposition is employed on nearly forty other occasions in the *Apocalypse*, and always regularly with the genitive.

The relative pronoun is constructed in Hebrew fashion in ii. 7, "To him who conquers, I will give him," and in vi. 4, "And to him, who was sitting on it, there was given to him."

As to conjunctions, we note that ἵνα, "in order that," is preceded by καί, "and," in xiii. 17, according to the corrected Sinaitic, the Alexandrian A, the Vatican Q, the Porphyrian P, many Greek cursives, the Latin Vulgate, the Armenian and Ethiopic version and *Arethas*, but not in the Sinaitic or *Eph-*

raem C, the cursives 6, 28, 32, 79, 96, the Bohairic or the Syriae version, the Latin translation of St. Irenaeus, Hippolytus or Primasium. Though *οὖν*, "therefore," is very frequent in the *Gospel*, it only occurs six times, i. 19, ii. 5, 16, iii. 3, 3, 19, in the *Apocalypse*, and is not found once in the true text of the *First Epistle*. Naturally, *καί*, "and," is more suitable to the *Apocalypse*, which so resembles Hebrew poetry in its arrangement, and adds detail to detail to form the complex symbols. Then *ὅταν*, "whenever," which regularly takes a verb in the subjunctive, is used with the future indicative in iv. 9. The future implies a fact to be; the conjunction suggests the uncertainty of the time; but the two together are equivalent to a frequentative future.

With regard to the tenses, there is strict regularity in many passages. In i. 7, ii. 5, 16, 22, iii. 9, the present passes into the future. But the use of a present and a future verb together is found very often in the Greek Vulgate, as for example, in *Zechariah*, ii. 9, 10, xi. 6. The construction is really due to the sequence of tenses in Hebrew. There, as Gesenius says in his *Grammar*, § 49, 1, in continued narrative of the past, the first verb alone is in the past tense, the others being in the future form; and, on the contrary, in continued descriptions of the future, the first verb alone is in the future tense, the others being in the past. So in the *Apocalypse*, the angel swears

- x. 6 i That there will no longer be time,
7 But [the end will be] in the days

Of the voice of the seventh angel,
Whenever he may be about to sound,

And the mystery of God will be finished,
As He evangelised His own bondmen, the prophets.

The Greek verb, *ἐτελέσθη*, "it was finished," x. 7 d, follows *ἔσται*, "there will be," x. 6 i, in Hebrew fashion, and must therefore be rendered in English as a future, "it will be finished."

Finally, the perfect *εἶρηκα*, "I have said," in vii. 14, and the perfect *εἰληφεν*, "he has taken," in viii. 5, are used as vividly realistic. The futures in the description of the New Jerusalem, xxi. 24-27, are employed of events really future; and those in xxii. 3-5, are required, because the name on the foreheads is still invisible, and the Vision of the Blest still unattained.

GEORGE S. HITCHCOCK.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Italy in the Thirteenth Century. By Henry Dwight Sedgwick. In two volumes. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1913. Vol. I, pp. x + 440. Vol. II, pp. 398.

The Thirteenth Century is often spoken of as the greatest century of the Middle Ages. At any rate it was a great century. Each country contributed to its riches: England brought Magna Charta, the beginnings of Parliament, Bishop Grosseteste, Roger Bacon, and Simon of Montfort; France gave the Cathedrals of Paris, Rheims and Amiens, her University, her literature, and St. Louis; Spain added the culture of Moor and Jew at Cordova and Seville, Alphonso the Wise of Castile, James of Aragon the Conqueror, and St. Dominic; Germany presented her victories over the heathen in the East, the Hanseatic towns, Walter von der Vogelweide, Albertus Magnus and Rudolph of Hapsburg. But the contribution of Italy was the most important of all; she showed "more energy, more productive power, more many sided genius than any of them: no other country can produce a list of men to match Innocent III, Frederick II, St. Francis, Ezzelino da Romano, Thomas Aquinas, Niccola Pisano, Giotto and Dante, nor matters of such world-wide concern as the Papacy, the Holy Roman Empire or the Franciscan movement." Such, at least, is the opinion of Mr. Henry Dwight Sedgwick who, in the two ample volumes under notice, has set himself the ambitious and attractive task of telling the story of Italy in the Thirteenth Century. To review his work with any detail would be to write an article. We must content ourselves, therefore, with a general survey of its contents.

The period of Italian history covered by the present volumes is so crowded with affairs of moment and with memorable men; documents, biographies and monographs bearing upon it are so numerous, that it is not easy to present in mere outline a true picture of the times. The author has here laid stress on those topics that seem to him most interesting and the variety of matters he has put together—religion, politics, literature, art, trade

guilds and other subjects not of a piece—goes to account for the apparent patch work of Mr. Sedgwick's book. It is, in fact, a series of literary essays rather than a formal or closely woven historical record. Thus in Volume I, after a short introductory chapter intended to show "where the way leads," we have twenty-nine separate chapters which deal in succession with Innocent III as Priest, as Preacher and as *Dominus Dominantium*; with Joachim of Fiore "the Prophet"; with Papal Jurisprudence; with St. Francis and his first disciples; with the Emperor Frederick II and his relations with Gregory IX; with Provençal and Sicilian Poetry; with the Lombard Communes; with Bologna, her constitution, her university and with some of its professors; with the nobles of the North; with Italian art in its earliest development and its thirteenth-century applications; with Innocent IV; with Gothic architecture; with the progress of the Franciscan order; with the disciples of Joachim of Fiore; with King Manfred; with Tuscany (1200-1260) and with the city of Florence. Volume II contains twenty chapters which treat of the following topics in the order given: the intermediate poets; Venice; the French Conquest; Charles the Conqueror; the Pontificates of Gregory X, Nicholas III and Boniface VIII; St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure; Lombardy, Romagna, Piedmont and Tuscany (1260-1290); thirteenth century manners and history; sculpture and painting with special reference to the pupils of Niccola Pisano; the frescoes at Assisi; *il dolce stil nuovo*; Latin literature; the outrage at Anagni. The last chapter is followed by an Epilogue in which Mr. Sedgwick insists that the greatest gifts of thirteenth-century Italy to the world are the ideals which S. Francis and Dante held up in word and deed, "Through these two men," he concludes, "Italy of the thirteenth century has given us a part of the best that we possess."

Such in barest outline are the subjects which the author deals with in the present work. The task of condensing the vast amount of material bearing upon these subjects in such a way as to be at once readable and reasonably complete is indeed a difficult one. And the difficulty is aggravated by the lack of agreement among scholars as to several of the questions touched upon; in regard to some of these questions, "controversies are thick as blackberries and prickly as their thorns." Mr. Sedgwick tells us that he has tried to write without bias and he is to be congratulated on the

success with which he has carried out this intention. Taken as a whole, his present contribution to the literature of mediæval history is commendably impartial and discerning readers will make allowances for statements which are never intentionally unfair. The interlacing of causes, occasions and circumstances in the eight hundred odd pages in which Mr. Sedgwick sketches Italy in the *Ducento* is, however, far from being outside the range of criticism, but then, where there is so much that is good, we are reluctant to carp at the few blemishes inevitable in a book like the one before us. To be sure the author has by no means said the last word as to any of the topics upon which he touches and there is yet room for a modern, comprehensive, scientific survey of the same field. In default, however, of such a work, Mr. Sedgwick has here provided an eminently readable, though a far from complete record, full of interesting matter for the average reader and one which will thus find acceptance with many to whom a severely critical work would not appeal. It remains to be said that the author is thoroughly in sympathy with his subject and that he handles it with enthusiasm—for he has fallen under the spell of thirteenth-century Italy. He is specially strong on her art and poetry and, so far as he could, he has introduced the personages of the *Divina Commedia* in order that his book may serve in a manner as an historical introduction to Dante. The Appendix contains a helpful chronology and bibliography of the period covered by the two volumes. There is also a very good index. A series of thirty-two appropriate illustrations further enhances the merits of the work.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

Economics as the Basis of Living Ethics. A Study in Scientific Social Philosophy. By John G. Murdock, A. M. Pp. 373. Allen Book Printing Company, Troy, New York.

The following passage may be picked out from many pages, scattered throughout this volume, of similar import, as presenting the thesis which the author supports:—"Any interpretation of history which aims to deal with real force-bearing factors must henceforth make intelligible peace with the economic factor or else straightway to the rubbish heap. The totality of man is not

denied. But the foundation of the whole man is material. Material conditions are the determinants of mass movements, are directive of, and the source of great human changes. Apart from this foundation there is no real history of the human race. On the foundation of the production and distribution of material goods arise, interact, and perish the innumerable fabrications of the human spirit."

The writer, however, does not maintain his economic theory in the rankly materialistic form in which its socialist parents clothed it. He admits that love, charity, justice, law, morality, art, culture, literature, philosophy, all have their share in determining the total aspect of any historical epoch. But, he warns us that it is impossible to divorce them safely from their material source. Neither the reformer nor the philosopher, he very truly affirms, can afford to ignore the physical conditions under which man lives and provides for his physical necessities. He devotes a chapter to a criticism of Kant's ethics from this point of view; and passes some very effective criticisms on *a-priorism*. Three chapters discuss the question of interest. The examination and condemnation of Clark's Productivity Theory, and the Boehm-Bawerk Theory are the most valuable parts of the work. The injustice of interest in any form is maintained by Mr. Murdock as uncompromisingly as it was by any of the staunch theologians who treated the subject in the past. In his effort to prove that all our moral standards are derived from the varying conditions under which man at various times has found himself situated with regard to making provision for his physical needs, Mr. Murdock insists upon the variations that have arisen in moral codes and standards as a consequence of variations in economic conditions. Under this stress, what was just or right at one time becomes unjust or wrong at another. But he has not faced the question which no person who would prove that all our moral ideas are derived from the economic. How does it happen that in all the shiftings and variations which have occurred in human history men have always displayed an invincible and indestructible tendency to apply to life and action a standard differing from the standard of utility, that of right and wrong? Nor in the numerous historic instances which he cites to prove his theory, do we find him explaining what economic changes in the world sent out the fishermen of Galilee to preach Christ crucified.

Stolen Waters. A page in the Conquest of Ulster. By T. M. Healy. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. x + 492.

The title of Mr. Healy's long but interesting narrative of the recent *cause célèbre* in which he was one of the leading counsel is, unfortunately for justice, only too literal. In 1911, the House of Lords gave judgment against the fisherman of Lough Neagh, and deprived them of their immemorial right to eke out a livelihood by fishing for pollan, in the Lough. The history of the case begins with the promise made to the London Companies, by James I, that he would grant them, for considerations received, the fishery of the River Bann. This promise was broken and the Londoners were defrauded, through the machinations of the Lord Deputy of Ireland, Sir Arthur Chichester, who obtained the fishery for himself. The long story that runs from the times of the Stuarts, up to the present day, is replete with frauds, perpetrated under the guise of legality, by, or in the interest of the Chichesters, the Donegalls, the Massereenes and those who had derived from them. The climax of injustice is reached in a forged lease, which, by means of surreptitious interlineations of the words "and Lough Neagh" introduced into the text, became the evidence on which was grounded the final decision of the ultimate tribunal of English law which deprived, in favor of the heirs of the Chichesters, the fisherman of Lough Neagh of the right of common fishery which even the Plantation of Ulster had spared to the kinsmen of the O'Neills and O'Donnells. The story of this cause is one which, to use a phrase of Mr. Healy, pierces to the marrow of Irish history. In the final trial the Law Lords stood three to three on the question of the validity of the lease referred to. Lord Ashbourne, the Irish Lord Chancellor, refused to endorse the lease, holding "that the judgment goes too far in holding the right claimed to be established in respect of the entire area of Lough Neagh." But by something like a legal technicality, which Mr. Healy explains, Lord Ashbourne was finally counted as voting with the majority. As one closes this account of egregious oppression one cannot but concur in the author's hope: May it appear, by what the history offers that the cause of justice is no lost cause, and that riches and power and laws are in vain brigaded against the commonweal. Perhaps when truth is known pity may be moved or statesmen stirred to rescue the forlorn.

Marriage, Divorce and Morality. By Henry C. Day, S. J. New York. Benziger. Pp. xi + 75.

Although the five sermons which make up this book are comparatively short and deal with no less extensive a general topic than the signs and causes of the growing laxity of morals, they touch on all the main topics of the problem. The writer speaks frankly, without overstepping the decorum of the pulpit, on race degeneration, the falling birth-rate, and the methods of regeneration proposed by the advocates of modern Eugenics. He has but little confidence in this system as a saviour of society, and amply supports his judgment with argument. His chief charge against it is that in its "valuations" no notice is taken of the supernatural, and it proposes the production of physical fitness as an end in itself.

Dante and the Mystics: A Study of the Mystical Aspect of the *Divina Commedia* and its Relations with some of its Mediæval Sources. By Edmund G. Gardner, M. A., with three photogravure plates. London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1913. Pp. xvi + 358.

The large literature in English on Dante and the *Divina Commedia* has received an addition of first rate importance in the volume before us. Its author is already well known as a Dante scholar, having written much and lectured a great deal, on the famous poet. This, his latest work, includes portions of courses of public lectures delivered during the last three academical sessions at University College, London, and it is well that these studies should have been brought together and offered to a larger public than in the original form. As the title of the book indicates, its main purpose is to lay stress upon the mystical aspect of the *Divina Commedia*, to trace the influence upon Dante of the earlier mystics from St. Augustine onwards, and to illustrate the mystical tendency of the sacred poem by its analogies with the writings of other contemporary or even later, masters in the same "science of love." For the study of the mediæval sources of the *Divina Commedia* especially from the mystical aspect is mainly one of analogies and general tendencies. Mr. Gardner treats successively

of the mysticism of Dante, of the Poet's appeal to St. Augustine in defence of the mysticism of the *Paradiso*, of Dante and Dionysius and, again, of Dante and St. Bernard, Dante and the Victorines, Dante and the Franciscan Mystics—St. Francis, St. Bonaventure and Ubertino da Casale—and Dante and the two Mechthilds. It is easy, Mr. Gardner thinks, and, in the present enthusiasm for Franciscan studies, tempting, to overestimate both the general influence of "Franciscanism" upon Italian literature and its specific influence upon Dante. Be this as it may, we should like to know more than the author has chosen to give us as to the connection between Dante and Jacopone da Todi, whose death (1306) was almost contemporaneous with the beginning of the *Divina Commedia*.

It is, perhaps, worthy of note that Mr. Gardner assumes, without discussion, the authenticity of the Letter to Can Grande, which is of primary importance to the student of the mystical side of the *Divina Commedia*, alike for the question of personal experience and for that of the literary sources of the poet's mysticism. No doubt his investigations as to the influence of St. Augustine, St. Bernard and Richard of St. Victor, upon the sacred poem will be regarded as most valuable even by those scholars who do not accept the appeal to the authority of these three mystics, in the Letter, as a genuine utterance of Dante. It is a matter of regret that the author did not consult the recent studies of Manfredi Porena, Giuseppe Picciòla, Augusto Mancini, and Michele Scherillo on the question of "Matelda," which, as Dr. Moore has observed, involves "one of the thorniest problems in the *Divina Commedia*. In passing we may say that both Mancini and Scherillo have ably supported the identification of "Matelda" with Mechthild of Hackeborn which was first suggested by Antonio Lubin, undoubtedly a pioneer in attempting to interpret the mysticism and allegory of the *Divina Commedia* in the light of the Letter to Can Grande. But this oversight does not, of course, seriously detract from the value of Mr. Gardner's present volume, which but strengthens his claim to be reckoned amongst the most accomplished and authoritative of modern writers on the *Divina Commedia*. In giving us these studies he has conferred a signal service on all lovers of Dante and the mystics. The book is most attractive in externals as well as in contents. For consultation and reference its usefulness is increased by a table of parallel passages in Dante and

the mystical writers quoted, by a lengthy list of the works and editions cited and by a full and informing index.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

Of Six Mediæval Women. To which is added a Note on Mediæval Gardens. By Alice Kemp-Welch, with introduction and illustrations. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913. Pp. xxix + 189.

This book is intended to afford those who are interested in the Middle Ages a general view of the manner of life of the women of the time. But on this subject—a very large one and one only partially explored—light can only be thrown gradually. For this there are various reasons. One is that mediæval historiographers and chroniclers were chiefly engaged in recounting the deeds of kings and feats of arms. Then again to get any true insight into the life of the woman of the Middle Ages we must study the small details of everyday life which go so largely to make up a woman's life, and such details have generally been taken for granted by writers on the subject. Furthermore, as the author observes, self-advertisement was not a mediæval fashion and the spirit of self-effacement which is considered a salient characteristic of the Middle Ages finds, perhaps, its highest expression in the lives of the women, who seldom ventured beyond town or castle or convent walls. Indeed, it is only women who were prominent through their high official positions or who interpreted the mysteries of Divine love to mediæval society from whom the veil has been withdrawn and even amongst such as these it has sometimes been only very slightly lifted. In order, therefore, to form some idea and estimate of women generally in the Middle Ages, the author has perforce to "fall back on reasoning from the known to the unknown, and, by studying the few who are recorded in written history, judge of that great majority who, though nameless, have yet so largely helped to make up the world's unwritten history."

Premising this the author of the volume under review tells us of six women whom she regards as types of the influential women of the Middle Ages. They are Roswitha the Nun, "a tenth century Dramatist"; Marie de France, "a twelfth century Romance-

writer"; Mechthild of Magdeburg, "a thirteenth century Mystic and Beguine"; Mahaut, Countess of Artois, "a fourteenth century Art-Patron and Philanthropist"; Christine de Pisan, "a fifteenth century Feministe," and Agnes Sorel, "the mistress and inspirer of Charles the Seventh." This selection is one that will probably evoke different appreciations from different readers and we venture to think that some, at least, of the views expressed in the Introduction as well as in the outline sketches of these six mediæval women, will be received with a certain measure of reserve or qualification. But there is much in the present volume that is thoughtful and suggestive and its author deserves our thanks for seeking to bring us into closer touch with the life of the women of the Middle Ages. Not the least interesting chapter in the book is the "Note on Mediæval Gardens" and a special word of praise is due for the rendering of Christine de Pisan's verses on Joan of Arc. The illustrations, which are mostly taken from early Books of Hours and illuminated mss. have been carefully chosen and admirably reproduced. The *format* of the volume reflects great credit on the publishers.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Summer Session of Teachers College—Report of the Secretary.

The Third Summer Session of Teachers College of the Catholic University of America, which was held from June 29 to August 8, surpassed all previous sessions in point of attendance and extent of work accomplished. Three hundred and eighty-three students were enrolled: 329 taking the courses offered in the University proper, and 54 taking the courses of Trinity College. Of these students 307 were members of 27 religious orders and congregations, representing 75 religious houses of the United States and Canada, and 22 were lay women. The students came from 48 dioceses; from 29 States, and the Dominion of Canada.

CHART 1

CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

Sisters at University.....	307
Lay Women at University.....	22
Sisters at Trinity College.....	54
Total.....	383
Religious Orders and Congregations.....	27
Motherhouses.....	75
Dioceses.....	48
States.....	29
Canada.....	21

STUDENTS ACCORDING TO STATES

Alabama	4	Kansas	3
California	2	Kentucky	16
Connecticut	8	Maryland	8
District of Columbia.....	18	Massachusetts	8
Georgia	5	Michigan	6
Illinois	6	Minnesota	4
Indiana	10	Missouri	7
Iowa	6	New Hampshire.....	2

New Jersey.....	33	South Carolina.....	2
New York.....	61	Tennessee	7
North Carolina.....	2	Texas	17
Ohio	26	Virginia	3
Oklahoma	1	West Virginia.....	6
Pennsylvania	23	Wisconsin	12
Rhode Island.....	2		

CHART 2

STUDENTS ACCORDING TO DIOCESES

Baltimore	9	Manchester	2
Boston	2	Mobile	4
Brooklyn	4	Montreal	14
Buffalo	24	Nashville	7
Charleston	2	Newark	33
Chatham	2	New York.....	28
Chicago	4	North Carolina.....	2
Cincinnati	11	Ogdensburg	2
Cleveland	12	Oklahoma	1
Concordia	3	Ottawa	3
Covington	10	Peoria	2
Davenport	2	Philadelphia	10
Detroit	6	Pittsburg	6
Dubuque	4	Providence	2
Duluth	12	Quebec	2
Erie	3	Richmond	2
Fall River.....	6	St. Cloud.....	2
Fort Wayne.....	2	St. Louis.....	7
Galveston	6	San Antonio.....	11
Green Bay.....	5	San Francisco.....	2
Hartford	8	Savannah	5
Indianapolis	8	Seranton	4
La Crosse.....	7	Toledo	3
Louisville	6	Wheeling	5

CHART 3

REGISTER OF STUDENTS

Benedictines.....	24
Duluth, Minn.....	2

Bristow, Va.....	2
Elizabeth, N. J.....	11
Cullman, Ala.....	4
Ferdinand, Ind.....	2
St. Joseph, Minn.....	2
Guthrie, Okla.....	1
Charity	31
Mount St. Vincent, N. Y.....	20
Convent Station, N. J.....	5
Greensburg, Pa.....	4
Mount St. Joseph, Hamilton County, Ohio....	2
Charity, B. V. M.....	4
Dubuque, Iowa.....	4
Christian Education.....	2
Arlington Heights, Mass.....	2
Divine Providence.....	15
Newport, Ky.....	10
San Antonio, Texas.....	5
Dominicans.....	32
Nashville, Tenn.....	3
Caldwell, N. J.....	17
Sinsinawa, Wis.....	7
Galveston, Texas.....	3
Adrian, Mich.....	2
Franciscans	23
Buffalo, N. Y.....	6
Stella Niagara, N. Y.....	3
Oldenburg, Ind.....	3
Alverno, Wis.....	5
Clinton, Iowa.....	2
Glen Riddle, Pa.....	4
Gray Nuns of the Cross.....	3
Ottawa, Ont.....	3
Holy Cross.....	2
Notre Dame, Ind.....	2

Holy Names	4
Montreal, Can.....	2
Oakland, Cal.....	2
Hotel Dieu	2
Chatham, N. B.....	2
Humility of Mary.....	3
Lowellville, Ohio.....	3
Immaculate Heart of Mary.....	6
Scranton, Pa.....	2
Monroe, Mich.....	4
Charity of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Texas.....	5
Sisters of Jesus-Mary.....	7
Fall River, Mass.....	2
Woonsocket, R. I.....	2
Sillery, P. Q., Canada.....	2
New York City N. Y.....	1
Lay Women.....	22
Loretto at the Foot of the Cross.....	4
Loretto, Nerinx, Ky.....	4
Mercy	44
Nashville, Tenn.....	4
Gabriels, N. Y.....	2
Titusville, Pa.....	3
Hartford, Conn.....	8
Belmont, N. C.....	2
Manchester, N. H.....	2
Chicago, Ill.....	4
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	2
Charleston, S. C.....	2
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....	2
Buffalo, N. Y.....	4
Ottawa, Ill.....	2
Mount Washington, Md.....	7
Notre Dame, Congregation of.....	8
Montreal, Can.....	8

Notre Dame of Namur.....	2
Washington, D. C.....	2
Precious Blood.....	4
Maria Stein, Ohio.....	4
Providence	3
St. Mary-of-the-Woods.....	3
Sacred Heart of Mary.....	7
Tarrytown, N. Y.....	7
Sisters of St. Ann.....	4
Lachine, P. Q.....	4
St. Joseph.....	32
Augusta, Ga.....	5
Brentwood, L. I.....	4
Wheeling, W. Va.....	5
Concordia, Kans.....	3
Baden, Pa.....	2
St. Louis, Mo.....	7
Chestnut Hill, Pa.....	6
St. Mary	11
Lockport, N. Y.....	11
Union of the Sacred Hearts	4
Fall River, Mass.....	4
Ursulines	21
Cleveland, Ohio.....	9
Galveston, Texas.....	3
St. Martin's, Brown County, Ohio.....	2
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	1
Louisville, Ky.....	2
Toledo, Ohio.....	3
San Antonio, Texas.....	1

The courses announced in the official program of the Third Summer Session, 82 in all, were given without change. Ten of these constituted the continuation courses in the natural sciences, Physics, Chemistry and Biology, given from August 18 to September 26, which were arranged for the accommodation of students

who had registered in them before August 8. The lecture courses consisted of 30 hours each, with the exception of three, the public lectures given by the professors of the Department of Education, Drs. Pace, Shields and McCormick, which were of 6 hours each. The laboratory periods of 2 hours daily, amounted to 60 hours each in Physics, Chemistry and Biology, or 120 hours each, including those of the continuation session. There was, consequently, a total of 2,088 lectures in the regular session, and a total of 150 lectures and the same number of laboratory periods in the continuation session. Thirty-six instructors were engaged for the work of the Session of whom 27 are members of the teaching staff of the University.

The school day lasted from 8 A. M. until 6 P. M., with a recess of two hours at noon. Most of the Sisters were given residence accommodations on the University grounds. Gibbons Hall, which was completed during the year 1912-13, offered such increased facilities that it was unnecessary to open Albert Hall and St. Thomas' College. The Sisters occupied all other buildings of the University, Trinity College, various convents in Brookland, and the city of Washington. The dining room being open to all, the students were enabled to pass the day in class work or study without leaving the University campus.

On Wednesday, July 16th, his Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, visited the Summer School. He arrived at noon and all of the students were assembled in the Chapel of Divinity Hall to hear his address. The Cardinal expressed his delight at witnessing the increased number of students in attendance and warmly encouraged the Sisters and lay teachers in their studies. He later presided at Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament. After the ceremony all of the students were individually presented to him.

The Welcome Committee of the National Catholic Women's Circle, who kindly received the Sisters on their arrival in Washington, conducted small parties of the students to the many points of historical interest in Washington and to the Government buildings. Saturday mornings, which were free of class duties, offered occasion for these pleasant and instructive excursions, the most delightful of which was that to Mount Vernon.

The Retreat for Sisters opened on the evening of Friday, August 8, and was conducted, as on last year, by the Rev. Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.

PATRICK J. MCCORMICK,

Secretary.

Colleges and High Schools Affiliated with the University.

The following institutions, in addition to those whose names appeared in the June *Bulletin*, having complied with all the requirements for affiliation, have been duly affiliated:

COLLEGE

Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of Divine Providence.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Mary Immaculate Academy, Wichita Falls, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

College and Academy of the Incarnate Word, Alamo Heights, San Antonio, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word.

Academy Notre Dame of Providence, Newport, Kentucky, conducted by the Sisters of Divine Providence.

Sacred Heart Academy, Waco, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, New York.

St. Edward's Academy, Dallas, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

St. Xavier's Academy, Denison, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, New York.

St. Joseph's Academy, Sherman, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

Mary Immaculate Academy, Buffalo, New York, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, New York.

St. Joseph's Academy, Lockport, N. Y., conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

St. Ignatius Academy, Ft. Worth, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

Our Lady of Victory College and Academy, Fort Worth, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

Our Lady of Good Counsel Academy, Dallas, Texas, conducted by the Sisters of St. Mary, Lockport, N. Y.

Loretto Heights Academy, Loretto, Colorado, conducted by the Sisters of Loretto, Loretto, Kentucky.

Mount St. Joseph Academy, Augusta, Georgia, conducted by the Sisters of St. Joseph.

Villa Marie Convent, Notre Dame de Grace, Montreal, Canada, conducted by the Sisters of the "Congregation de Notre Dame de Montreal."

Annual Convention of Catholic Educators.

The Tenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Educational Association took place at New Orleans, La., June 30, July 1, 2, and 3. On the first day the regular annual meeting of the Executive Board was held, and the work of the Association was gone over in detail. The reports of the officers showed a gratifying increase in the membership during the year and an extension of the work. The financial condition of the Association is satisfactory, and indicates a general recognition and appreciation of the value of the work accomplished by the organization.

The convention opened with pontifical Mass in the Mater Dolorosa Church, and at the end of the services Archbishop Blenk delivered an address of welcome. The cordiality of the Archbishop's sentiments, and the wisdom of his advice made a deep impression on the large audience of Catholic educators. After the Mass the members of all departments met at Loyola University, which had been generously placed at the disposal of the convention by the Jesuit Fathers. Monsignor Shahan, President General of the Association, opened the meeting with a very happy address, in which he pointed out the fact that the favorable regard in which the Association has been held places on the members a great responsibility. The following letter of His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate was read:

"The efforts of the Catholic Educational Association to elevate and render more perfect and useful the standards of educational work cannot but meet with the approval of all good people and particularly with that of the Holy See. Hence it is with pleasure that I learn that the Catholic educators will convene at New Orleans under the auspices of His Grace, Most Rev. James H. Blenk, for the purpose of studying the many vital and important questions of education, and I most sincerely hope their endeavors will meet with the intended success.

"JOHN BONZANO,
Apostolic Delegate."

The leading theme of the papers and discussions in the general and departmental meetings this year was the curriculum. At the opening and general session of the convention a paper on "The Problem of the Curriculum," by the Rev. F. W. Howard, Secretary General, sounded the keynote and suggested the lines for many of the discussions which followed. The paper was formally discussed by Brother John Waldron, S. M., of Clayton, Mo.; the Rev. H. S. Spaulding, S. J., of Chicago, Ill.; and the Very Rev. J. A. Burns, C. S. C., of Washington, D. C.

A paper on "The Standard College," by the Very Rev. James P. O'Mahoney, C. S. V., President of St. Viator's College, Bourbonnais, Ill., opened the proceedings of the College Department. It was followed on Wednesday by a paper on "The Teaching of Philosophy in Our Colleges, the Status of the Question," by the Very Rev. E. A. Pace, of the Catholic University of America. Other papers in the same department were: "Science in the High School and College," by the Rev. Daniel J. McHugh, C. M., of De Paul University, Chicago, Ill.; discussed by the Very Rev. R. H. Smith, S. M., President of Jefferson College, La.; "The Curriculum of the Commercial High School," by Brother L. Joseph, C. B. Under the auspices of the College Department a successful public meeting was held on Wednesday evening in the interest of Catholic higher education.

The general topic for discussion in the Seminary Department was "The Curriculum of Our Seminaries." Papers were read by the Rev. Herman J. Heuser, D. D., and the Rev. Francis P. Siegfried, of St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.; and the Very Rev. John B. Peterson, S. T. L., Rector of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

The Parish School Department considered at its opening session a paper on "Vocational Guidance," by the Rev. Albert Muntsch, S. J., of St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., which was discussed by Brother Engelbert, C. S. C., of Holy Cross College, New Orleans, La., and Brother Edward, F. S. C., President of Manhattan College, New York City. On Wednesday, July 2, the Rev. Daniel J. Lavery, D. D., of St. Louis, Mo., read a paper on "The Pastor and the Schools, from the Financial Standpoint." The Rev. Thomas V. Tobin, of Little Rock, Ark., who was appointed to discuss the paper, was unable to attend. His paper was read by the Rev. Michael J. Larkin, of New York City. On Thursday

this department conducted two meetings: in the first, which was held for the teachers of the Province of New Orleans, the following program was presented: "Child Study," by the Rev. John D. McKenna, Superintendent of Parish Schools, Brooklyn, N. Y.; discussed by Brother Florentius, C. S. C., of Holy Cross College, New Orleans, La., and Brother Bernardne, F. S. C., of the Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., "Uniformity of Text-Books," by a Sister of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Texas; discussed by the Rev. S. P. Heuber, C. M., of New Orleans, La., and a Missionary Sister of the Sacred Heart, of New Orleans, La. The second meeting was arranged for pastors and diocesan superintendents of parish schools and here was considered the paper, "The Priest's Adaptability for School Work," by Rev. John Ryan, of St. Paul's Church, Cambridge, Mass. It was discussed by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. P. R. McDevitt, Superintendent of Parish Schools, Philadelphia, Pa.; the Rev. F. V. Nugent, of St. Stephen's Church, New Orleans, La.; and the Rev. F. L. Gassler, of the Church of the Annunciation, New Orleans, La.

The superintendents of parish schools debated practical questions occasioned by the following papers: "The Superintendent's Visit to the School; How to Make It Most Fruitful," by the Rev. J. A. Dillon, Superintendent of Parish Schools, Newark, N. J., the discussion of the Rev. J. B. O'Leary, of St. Mary's Seminary, La Porte, Texas, being read by Rev. Father Eaton. "The Need of Men Teachers in Educational Work," by the Rev. Bede Horsa, O. S. B., of St. Joseph's Seminary, St. Benedict, La., discussed by Very Rev. Thomas J. Larkin, S. M., of the Holy Name of Mary Church, New Orleans, La., the Very Rev. Thomas J. Weldon, C. M., of St. Joseph's Church, New Orleans, and Brother John Waldron, of Clayton, Mo. On Wednesday was considered the paper, "How Can We Meet the Demand for Industrial and Vocational Training?" by the Rev. Michael J. Larkin, Superintendent of Schools, New York; discussed by Brother Joseph Matthew, F. S. C., of St. Louis, Mo., and Brother George M. Sauer, S. M., of Detroit, Mich.

Two meetings were held of the Provincials and representatives of religious communities engaged in teaching in the United States. Papers were read on "The Thorough Formation of Our Teachers in the Spirit and Observance of their Respective Orders, an Indispensable Condition to Sound and Successful Pedagogics," by the

Rev. William Power, S. J., of New Orleans, La.; "Problems Confronting Religious Superiors in the Professional Training of Their Teachers," by the Very Rev. J. C. Ei, S. M., President of St. Mary's College, San Antonio, Texas.

The public meeting held in Knights of Columbus Hall on the evening of July 3 brought the Convention to a successful close. Archbishop Blenk, of New Orleans, presided and gave the introductory address. The Rt. Rev. Mgr. Shahan, President General of the Association, thanked the Archbishop, clergy, committees, press, and people of New Orleans for their kindly treatment and splendid hospitality. Admirable addresses were then heard from Robert A. Hunter, of Alexandria, La., on "Catholic Education and Public Welfare," and by the Rev. Peter C. Yorke, D. D., of Oakland, Cal., on the "World's Desire."

The general and departmental Resolutions of the Association were as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THANKS

The Catholic Educational Association in its tenth Annual Convention assembled, desires to express its appreciation of the efforts of all those who have labored so earnestly to make this meeting a success. We wish to thank in the first place the Most Reverend James H. Blenk, S. M., Archbishop of New Orleans, and the Bishops of the province, the Right Rev. N. A. Gallagher of Galveston, the Rev. Edward P. Allen of Mobile, the Right Rev. Cornelius Van de Ven of Alexandria, the Right Rev. Joseph B. Lynch of Dallas, the Right Rev. John B. Morris of Little Rock and the Right Rev. John W. Shaw, of San Antonio, for their cordial reception to our delegates and their substantial interest in our proceedings.

We tender our thanks also to the reverend clergy, the religious communities, the local committees of the diocese, and to the Jesuit Fathers of Loyola University for their generous provision of facilities for the meeting of this Association. We are especially grateful to the Catholic and the daily press of the city for their co-operation in bringing the work of this convention to the attention of the general public.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

We return thanks to our Holy Father for his blessing, each year bestowed on this gathering of the Catholic Educators of the United States. We rejoice in his restoration to health, and pray that God may preserve him for years to come. We humbly tender him the expression of our filial love, our profound veneration and our entire obedience.

As Catholic Educators we pledge ourselves to renewed efforts under the direction of ecclesiastical authority to the service of Church and country in the grand cause of Christian Education. We regard this work of religious education as one on which the future welfare of our Nation depends.

We call attention to the great waste of public funds and the evil of the constantly increasing burden of taxation. This extravagance has resulted largely from a tendency on the part of the State to do for children what should be done for them by parents, and do for the citizen what he should do for himself. Let the State urge and encourage the citizen to care for his children, but let it not place unjust burdens on those who at great sacrifice are discharging this primal duty of parenthood. Let the State cherish the idea of parental responsibility as one of the foundation stones of American freedom.

Whereas: Liberty of education has always been recognized in our country as a basic principle; and

Whereas: the right of the parents to educate is one of those fundamental rights which cannot without injustice be interfered with; and

Whereas: The continued recognition of this right is essential to the preservation of a most cherished prerogative of American citizenship; be it

Resolved: That the Catholic Educational Association objects to any encroachment on this right to liberty of education; be it further

Resolved: That the Catholic Educational Association views with alarm the activities of certain individuals and corporations whose utterances and efforts threaten to interfere with the just liberties of private educational institutions.

Whereas: The Council of Education of the American Medical Association has elicited the aid of the Carnegie Foundation in the examination and classification of hospitals; and

Whereas: Said Carnegie Foundation has shown a spirit antagonistic to institutions under religious control; and

Whereas: There are more than five hundred hospitals in the United States under the direction and control of Catholics; be it

Resolved: That we hereby protest to the American Medical Association against the action of the Medical Council; and be it

Resolved: That we request the American Medical Association to instruct its Medical Council to discontinue the services of the Carnegie Foundation.

Whereas: All education should be so directed as to preserve moral purity, and the communication of knowledge relating thereto should be adapted to the age and growth of the child; and

Whereas: The communication of this necessary knowledge pertains of right to the parents and the divinely constituted guides of the children; be it

Resolved: That we protest against and condemn as subversive of true morality, the imparting of sexual knowledge to children as at present carried on in many private and public schools in the country.

Whereas, five thousand and more Catholic deaf and mute children, deprived of opportunity for receiving religious instruction, are losing their faith under non-Catholic influences, be it again resolved that every effort be made to give these handicapped children the same educational advantages accorded to the normal children of our Catholic parish schools.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE COLLEGE DEPARTMENT

1. The college department of the Catholic Educational Association recommends that the colleges of the Association require 128 semester hours as a minimum for graduation.

2. As there seems to be a general agreement among educators that pupils entering the secondary schools from the eighth grade are too far advanced in age, and that secondary education should begin at or about the age of twelve, we favor an arrangement whereby pupils may be able to begin their High School course after the completion of six years of elementary work.

3. While we favor the highest standards in education and heartily approve of every attempt to classify colleges according to just principles, we deprecate the action of the Federal Bureau of Education in its attempt to classify the colleges of the country in groups of A, B, and C, and we believe that in this work of classification the said Federal Bureau of Education has gone beyond the limits of its power.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE PARISH SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

1. We rejoice in the advancement of our educational institutions, and in the testimonies of the confidence of our Catholic people in their worth. We pledge ourselves to more earnest efforts to be faithful to the obligations of our calling and to inspire our children with devotion and love for the highest ideals of religion and patriotism.

2. The Christian child receives his first education in the religious atmosphere of a Christian home. He has a natural and indefeasible right to a Christian education and he suffers an injustice if he is committed to schools where that early religious influence is neutralized or antagonized.

3. We hold that the life and well-being of our Republic depend on resisting the influence of centralizing and devitalizing methods that have throttled enterprise in industry and have created our trusts; and that, in the name of efficiency, are now applied to education and are in danger of stifling initiative and private endeavor in this field.

4. Whereas modesty is the most becoming adornment of woman, we urge pastors and teachers to guard and warn children against vanity in dress, against the excessive love of pleasure, against the evils of the picture show, and against the influence of corrupt newspapers.

5. We respectfully urge pastors who under the Bishops are teachers of the people, to frequently impress on parents the great importance of home training, and the necessity of qualifying themselves by good lives

and the frequentation of the sacraments for the performance of this important duty.

6. We again return thanks to our Holy Father for his solicitude for the little children in admitting them at their early age to Holy Communion; and as Catholic teachers we bear testimony to the excellent fruits of this practice of early and frequent Communion.

7. We urge parents, teachers and pastors to watch over children that the purposes of Divine Providence may be discovered in their regard, and that the children may be aided in selecting their life work in conformity with their inclinations, aptitudes and opportunities.

8. We urge pastors to do all they can to watch over and foster the dispositions of those who manifest an inclination for religious life, to the end that the needs of the Church in this great work of education may be adequately supplied. Let children be taught that the way to be found worthy of the call of Grace is through the practice of self-denial and self-control.

9. We urge our teachers to avoid the current secular literature of the day which, lacking the basis of sound philosophy, cannot but produce partial and imperfect results. The Catholic Church is the great Mother of education and contains in her traditions and experience the greatest treasure of educational theory and practice.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

The Michael Jenkins Collection of Works on the History of Maryland. The Library has received from Michael Jenkins, Esq., of Baltimore, an important collection of works on the History, etc., of Maryland. There are in the collection some two hundred titles, including rare works, pamphlets and brochures. These have been placed in a case specially constructed for the reception in the General Reading Room of the Library and a Catalogue has been published descriptive of the Contents of the Collection. To the generous donor who has spent years in bringing these books together, the Catholic University of America is profoundly grateful.

Collection on the Monumental Brasses of England. A generous but anonymous friend of the University has presented to the Library a most valuable collection of works on the Monumental Brasses of England. The collection numbers 200 volumes, including some of the rarest works on this curious and interesting phase of Ecclesiastical Art. Every shire in England is represented by important facsimiles. In fact, the University is now in possession of one of the most complete collections of works on medieval ecclesiastical ornamentation. The collection represents the learned labors of a lifetime and places the University in debt of gratitude to the gifted and cultured gentleman who, for the present, at least, desires that his name be withheld from publication.

Registration. The total number of new lay students registered, up to date, is one hundred and fifty.

New Dining Hall. A new Dining Hall is under construction which, on being completed, will provide dining accommodations for six hundred students. The building will be three stories high, the two upper stories to be used for residence.

It will have two towers, rising to the same height as the tower of Gibbons Hall, which the new building resembles both in the material used and in the general style of architecture adopted. The Dining Hall on the first floor will be an unbroken space, 260 feet long, lighted with broad and lofty windows of the Collegiate Gothic type. One of the towers will contain provisions for accommodating the various Debating and Literary societies of the University.

Gibbons Hall. The grounds surrounding Gibbons Memorial Hall are being graded, concrete sidewalks are being laid down, and a roadway is being built to connect the sidewalks with the main entrance to the University.

Summer School. Elsewhere is published the Report of the Teachers' College, containing a description of the Summer Session of 1913.

Knights of Columbus Endowment Fund. The Endowment Fund being collected by the Knights of Columbus is nearing completion. It is said to amount to more than \$470,000, and steps are being taken for the presentation of the Fund to the University in the near future.

Margaret Barry Scholarship. By the Will of the late Miss Margaret Barry, of Washington, D. C., the University will receive the sum of \$10,000 for the foundation of a scholarship to be known as the Margaret Barry Scholarship. The University is grateful to the pious donor who has thus provided for the Catholic education of a long line of recipients of her generosity.

Appointments. A large number of new Appointments were made at the end of the last academic year or the beginning of this. The next number of the *Bulletin* will publish a complete list of these.

Resignation. Readers of the *Bulletin* and especially the clerical alumni of the University, will learn with regret that

Reverend Dr. Creagh has resigned the chair of Canon Law to resume work in his native Archdiocese of Boston. Dr. Creagh has been associated with the University as student and professor since 1901, and has held a most honorable and distinguished career as a priest, an instructor and a scholar of more than academic reputation. The best wishes of his colleagues accompany him to the new scene of his sacerdotal and professional labors.

